

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 5, 1997

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EWING].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 5, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable THOMAS W. EWING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Douglas Tanner, executive director, Faith and Politics Institute, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our creator, sustainer, and redeemer: We come before You mindful of what You require of us . . . to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with You. Yet we know that these are hardly the hallmarks of political life. We confuse justice with vengeance; we mistake kindness for weakness; we favor running proudly over walking humbly.

We know that we have been chosen as representatives, but we are often unsure about whether to seek to represent the best that is within our constituents and within ourselves, or to settle for the easier task of representing the baser instincts that reside within all of us.

Strengthen us. Give us the wisdom to recognize the qualities You require of Your servants, and grant us this day, we pray, the courage to risk embodying those qualities in an environment that often mitigates against it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CHABOT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The motion was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

MORNING 1-MINUTE SPEECHES SERVE IMPORTANT FUNCTION

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, a time-honored tradition in this body is now under attack. I am speaking of that period, this time right now, set aside each day for one-minute speeches.

It has been a long practice for Members to come to the well of the Chamber each morning to speak briefly about pending legislation, a tribute to a group or individual back in their district, or a soon-to-be introduced bill. Sadly, some would like to move those speeches to the end of the legislative

day, I believe to stifle debate. I, like many of my colleagues, strenuously oppose that idea.

One-minute speeches often give Members, particularly junior Members, a chance to speak when they otherwise might not have the opportunity to do so. As my colleagues know, a freshman or a sophomore Member might sit at a committee meeting for 2 hours before being able to pose one question to a witness. He or she, if lucky, might get 30 seconds to debate a pending bill on the floor. One-minute speeches give these Members and the people they represent back home a chance to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, let us not silence Members of this body. Let us not stifle debate. Let us not kill the one-minute speeches.

THE TIME IS NOW FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Times the Speaker attacked Democratic fund-raising and compares it to the Watergate scandal. Specifically, the Speaker is quoted in today's New York Times saying, "The Democratic fund-raising machine was the most systematic, large-scale effort to get around the law that I have seen since Watergate."

This comment is especially strange coming from someone who has admitted to abuses of the campaign finance system. The abuses were on such a scale that the Speaker has been fined \$300,000.

There is an old saying about people in glass houses not throwing stones, and I think it especially applies to the Speaker of this House. If the Speaker really cares about campaign finance reform, he should bring legislation to the floor immediately to correct the system. So far all we have seen is inaction by the Republicans on campaign finance reform.

KID TAX MUST GO

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, on the subject of campaign finance reform, I think there is a difference between enacting the laws that are in place and passing new laws to make it appear that there is a problem. There may be

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

changes that are needed in our campaign finance laws, but clearly there are laws on the books that address the very things that the Clinton administration has apparently engaged in. And if they are guilty on that, the laws will respond accordingly, and I think that the Speaker is speaking to that, and I certainly believe that the Speaker was right in speaking out on this.

The thing I want to mention, with the Democratic defeat of the Balanced Budget Amendment, the children of today are in a very bleak situation as respects the future. I am a father of 4 kids and I am sick and tired of the kid tax. The kid tax is when liberal politicians pass new entitlement programs so that they can get reelected today so that your children and my children can pay for it tomorrow. I believe that the kids in America are sick and tired of the kid tax and we need to balance the budget and quit spending their money.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO GET TO WORK

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as I awoke this morning I asked myself a question: Why are we all here? Why is the House of Representatives in session today and why should I be in Washington rather than in Massachusetts with my constituents?

Mr. Speaker, please indulge me while I review the House schedule for today: One, a resolution congratulating the people of Guatemala; two, a resolution congratulating the people of Nicaragua; and three, a resolution commending former Secretary Warren Christopher.

Now I salute the people of Guatemala and Nicaragua for their democratization, and I think Warren Christopher is a wonderful leader and a really great guy, but should this be the agenda for the week?

I was sent here to debate and legislate on issues of concern to Massachusetts, issues like expanding educational opportunity, guaranteeing that all of our children have health care, and comprehensively reforming our ugly system of campaign finance. I call upon Speaker GINGRICH to schedule votes on issues that affect the lives of working families, issues that really mean something. It is time for this Congress to get to work.

CONGRATULATIONS TO NICARAGUA

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today the House considers legislation to applaud our neighbors in Nicaragua. Seven

years ago, as an elections observer, I was sent there to see the Nicaraguan people draw the physical fight for freedom to a close successfully. That day they used the ballot box to officially cast off the Marxist government of Daniel Ortega, which once inexplicably found so many friends in Washington.

In 1990, instead of the chaos and violence of the Ortega regime, the Nicaraguans demanded peace, prosperity, justice and democracy. That historic year, the Chamorro government took the reins in difficult times, dealing admirably with the fallout of 5 years of Sandinista misrule.

With difficult issues like confiscated properties lingering, last month's peaceful transition to the Aleman administration is a significant achievement and a testament to the commitment and advancement of democracy in that country. It is only proper that today Congress pause for a minute to congratulate the Nicaraguans, to encourage them and to reiterate our support for democracy in that country.

BRING OUR JOBS HOME

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, jobs keep leaving America on the fast track. Wrangler Jeans is laying off 3,000 workers and moving 12 factories overseas. Apple Computer, they cut 1,500 jobs last year; they are cutting another 3,000 jobs this year. Shoemaker West is cutting 1,000 jobs, moving 3 factories overseas, and now, under WTO, Costa Rica is challenging Uncle Sam over underwear. Unbelievable.

American workers are not only losing their jobs, now they are about to lose their BVD's. It is getting so bad that in Longview, WA, a robber entered a grocery store wearing a pair of pink panties over his head. The police said they never saw anything like it.

What is the surprise, Mr. Speaker? Jobs are getting so scarce in America today robbers cannot even buy pantyhose. I yield back the balance of all the lingerie and all the other problems. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

CERTIFICATION OF MEXICO SENDS WRONG MESSAGE TO DRUG KINGPINS

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, on a subject of seriousness, what I want to talk about today, I find it a little difficult following the gentleman from Ohio.

It is shocking, Mr. Speaker, indeed shocking, that with all of the evidence before the President regarding the complicity of the Mexican Government

and the \$30 billion a year drug trade, that he has decided to certify Mexico as a reliable partner in the war on drugs. The President's certification of Mexico makes a mockery out of the certification process.

Ironically, within mere hours after the President announced that Mexico was certified as cooperating, Mexican authorities admitted that a suspected top drug money launderer had inexplicably escaped from police custody and that they knew this days before the certification decision was made.

Is this what the President calls cooperation? Was it not enough that Mexico's own drug czar was caught accepting bribes from the drug kingpins just last week? The President was duped.

I realize that Mexico is a friend and the United States-Mexican economics are intertwined, but certifying Mexico as cooperating sent the wrong message to the Mexican Government and to the drug kingpins.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACCUMULATION PROGRAM

(Mr. ROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 15 years, tuition at 4-year public universities has increased more than 4 times the increase in median household income. If we fail to act now, college will be affordable only for the rich in America.

I have cosponsored a bill with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO] called the Higher Education Accumulation Program. The bill will help make college affordable for middle and working class families by allowing parents to set up IRA's for their children's higher education. Parents will be able to make tax deductible \$5,000 contributions for each of their children for higher education. To deny a child an opportunity for an education is to deny that child a lifetime of opportunities.

The President and the Senate majority leader have endorsed this concept, and they have slightly different plans of their own. I ask that Members of the House, on a bipartisan basis, support the Higher Education Accumulation Program, H.R. 53, the HEAP Act, to help make college affordable for working and middle class families in America.

□ 1115

THE DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES ACT OF 1997

(Mr. PORTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

URGING ASSISTANCE FOR FLOOD VICTIMS IN 10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT AND OTHER AREAS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just arrived back in Washington from my district, which was hit very hard by the recent flooding. I want to commend the Clinton administration for agreeing to provide disaster aid, and urge this body to help those of us in my district and around the country that have been so devastated by these high waters.

I am also here this morning, Mr. Speaker, to introduce new legislation, with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], called the Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997. This legislation recognizes that the very serious and growing drug problem in this country is not going to be solved here in Washington, but is going to be solved at the local level, in our communities and neighborhoods.

The Federal Government has a role to play, of course, but even that role needs to be more focused on our communities. In order to receive Federal support under this new approach in our bill, a community must first show its commitment to reducing drug abuse in a comprehensive and long-term fashion.

There has to be substantial volunteer participation from kids, parents, businesses, schools, law enforcement, the media, and so on. A community must also show that the local effort can be sustained without Federal support. We do not want them to be dependent on the Federal Government. There is accountability in this bill. A community must evaluate whether it is actually having an impact in reducing drug abuse.

Importantly, this is not a matter of new money, but rechanneling existing monies will be used. We are rechanneling the existing \$16 billion we spend every year in fighting the drug war. This bill, Mr. Speaker, has grassroots support from around the country, from hundreds of communities.

I hope Members will join us in this bipartisan effort to create a drug-free America, neighborhood by neighborhood.

REPUBLICAN LACK OF A BUDGET PLAN WILL HURT EDUCATION

(Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, we are over 2 months into the 105th Congress, and yet the House has not taken any effort on a serious budget. We hear the complaints as a result of the President's plan on moving our country forward on education, and yet the Senate voted on a balanced budget amendment but we have not voted here in the House. We can hear the complaints

about the President's budget, but where is the Republican plan; or where is our plan, as a House Member?

The expression is, people in glass houses should not throw stones. This comes to mind in response to complaints about the President. I may not agree with his budget, but we do not have one either. Republicans cannot criticize the President's plan when they do not even have an alternative suggestion.

The Democrats have set up some priorities in the new budget. One of them is education. That effort is shared by over 80 percent of Americans. The President's 10-point plan on education is adequate. His proposals would boost funding for elementary and secondary education, for school construction, and improved classroom techniques. His proposals would help boost post-secondary education with \$1,500 HOPE scholarships for the first 2 years of college. We have illustrated what we want to do in the future for America. Let us get the budget to reflect those priorities, including education.

THE BLOOD OF THE PEOPLE WILL BE ON THE HANDS OF THE BUDGET CUTTERS

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, every day we hear more and more about what is wrong with the President's budget, yet his critics have not put on the table one plan, one proposal, one budget, or even one idea, except to talk about cutting and balancing, cutting the heart out of the neediest people in our country: children, senior citizens, the mentally ill, disabled, and the poor.

Balancing with the idea that we can get blood out of a turnip, that we can provide services and provide opportunities with very little or no money.

There are a lot of things that I do not know, but I do know one thing. I know that as Frederick Douglass taught, in this world we may not get all that we pay for, but we most certainly must pay for all that we get. We cannot have a great, civilized, and humane nation without paying the cost; if all we can do is cut, cut, cut, all that we will get is blood, blood, blood.

I tell you, the blood of the people will be on the hands of those who did the cutting.

URGING MAJORITY TO JOIN IN BUDGET PROCESS BY PRESENTING THEIR PLAN

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this House, I have

heard a lot of stories about the frenetic pace of the opening of the previous Congress. I heard of votes being taken late at night and working weekends. Now that I am here, elected by the people of the Ninth District of Texas, I cannot help but wonder what happened.

Is this what the majority means when they talk about wanting less Government?

Mr. Speaker, if this is the session when we are going to agree to do a balanced budget plan, we need to see activity from the other side of the aisle. They have criticized the President's plan. They have even called on the President to submit a second budget plan before submitting their own first budget on the most important issue this Congress will debate. I and many of my freshman colleagues are still waiting to see the evidence of the bipartisanship that we have heard so much about.

I join the Democratic leadership today in asking the majority party to join the budget process by presenting their plan. There are only 13 legislative days left until the April 15 budget deadline.

WE MUST MAKE CHILDREN'S HEALTH CARE OUR TOP PRIORITY IN THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we are voting today on a resolution regarding the display of the Ten Commandments. Whatever Members vote on this resolution, I think we can all agree: This is not the most pressing issue that is facing our Nation today.

Today the American people are much more concerned about the 10 million children living without health insurance in this country than they are with the issue of whether or not we hang the Ten Commandments on the wall.

We all know actions speak louder than words, and the Ten Commandments are important words; important words to me. But what about our actions? What is this body doing to help the children in this Nation, over 70,000 in my home State of Connecticut alone, that will go to sleep tonight without health insurance?

We are only spending time on this issue of the Ten Commandments because the GOP operative, William Kristol, suggested that this be done in the March 10 edition of the conservative publication, the Weekly Standard. The American people should be driving the agenda of this House and not Republican conservative operatives. We must make children's health care our top priority in this session of the Congress.

INFLATION DOES EXIST

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the fix is in. The American people are not yet aware of it. If we look on the front page of the Washington Post we see it: "Greenspan Backs Panel to Rule on Inflation Levels."

The dirty little back room deal that is about to be cut here between the White House and the Republican leadership is to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy, capital gains, business as usual at the Pentagon, and still balance the budget.

How do we do that? We do that through the magic of the CPI. We define away inflation and tell those seniors whose cost of health care is doubling at twice the rate of inflation every year, oh, it is better. It might cost more, you might not be able to afford it, but we are going to reduce your cost of living because it is better health care; that does not count as inflation.

We are going to say to the middle class whose taxes are going to go up if they lose indexation, oh well, yes, your taxes went up, but you know, that is because inflation does not really exist.

If inflation does not really exist, why are Alan Greenspan and the other members of the Federal Reserve Board paying themselves and their staff healthy 5 and 6 percent salary increases every year? That must not have anything to do with inflation.

It is time to play straight with the American people. Let us not politicize the CPI and stick it to seniors, the middle class, and children once again.

TIME TO GET ON WITH THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

(Mr. WEYGAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman, as a Democrat in the minority, and as a member of the Committee on the Budget, we have seen so many different things come before our committee, but we have seen no action. We have talked for many days and many months about campaign finance scandals, yet the main business of the people of America is being ignored.

This procrastination cannot go on. The President has submitted a budget, a budget that perhaps Members on both sides of the aisle may disagree on certain elements, but it is time to get on with that business; debate it, argue it, amend it, do whatever we must do, but let us forget about the political rhetoric. Let us move together in a bipartisan fashion. Let us work on the issues of Medicare, Medicaid, education, all of the real important issues to the people

of my district in Rhode Island and in America.

Let us stop this bickering. Let us move forward with a budget and let the Republicans, if they truly believe in making sure that this is an effective Congress, come forward with effective changes. Let us debate it and vote on it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 1 p.m. today.

CONGRATULATING PEOPLE OF GUATEMALA ON SUCCESS OF RECENT NEGOTIATIONS TO ESTABLISH PEACE PROCESS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 17) congratulating the people of Guatemala on the success of the recent negotiations to establish a peace process for Guatemala.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 17

Whereas on December 29, 1996, the Government of Guatemala and the representatives of the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca signed an historic peace accord ending 36 years of armed confrontation;

Whereas the peace accord includes the creation of a commission to implement a wide range of reforms to the political, economic, social, and judicial systems of Guatemala, including an enhanced respect for human rights and the rule of law, improved health and education services, attention to the needs of refugees and displaced persons, and the role of the military in a democratic society;

Whereas the peace accord represents the completion of a long and important negotiation process with the goal of achieving lasting peace, national reconciliation, political stability, and renewed economic growth in Guatemala; and

Whereas lasting peace, political stability, and economic development in Guatemala is in the best interest of all nations of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) congratulates the Guatemalan Government of President Alvaro Arzu for its extraordinary accomplishments in negotiating an end to hostilities and beginning the process of national reconciliation and reconstruction;

(2) recognizes the commitment of the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca in Guatemala to agree to end the dev-

astating warfare and to resolve their differences in a peaceful manner within a democratic political arena;

(3) commends all of the people of Guatemala for their determination to achieve a lasting peace and encourages their strong commitment to democratic principles and social justice for all; and

(4) affirms the commitment of the United States to help support a sustainable peace and development of strong democratic institutions in Guatemala.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], the original sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 17, a resolution I sponsored which congratulates President Arzu, the URNG, and the people of Guatemala for their recent success in concluding a peace agreement which brings to an end a civil war which has raged more than 30 years and has cost the lives of over 100,000 Guatemalans.

This resolution is one of those good news stories involving the Western Hemisphere which, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, I am very happy to report to my colleagues. The signing of the peace accords on December 29 concluded 6 years of negotiations between the two sides and established a framework within which the country will now embark on a process of peace, reconciliation, and reconstruction.

The Guatemalan people now join nations such as El Salvador and Nicaragua in choosing peace over war, democracy over anarchy, economic development over poverty and chaos, and social justice over exploitation and abuse.

The accords pose numerous challenges, and their success will surely test the wills and commitment of all sides. But the goals established in the accords were mutually arrived at, and the end results, when fully realized, will be very significant.

In fact, the effort put forth by both the government and the URNG through the long years of negotiations is already beginning to pay dividends.

□ 1130

Yesterday in what was clearly a signal of confidence in the peace process, some 30 guerrillas handed over their weapons to United Nations' observers. This act was the first of many similar events to take place throughout Guatemala in the coming months and serves notice that the commitment to peace is strong.

Mr. Speaker, with the problems we currently face in the hemisphere, especially with the issue of the war on

drugs, this recent news from Guatemala and Nicaragua as reflected in our other resolutions under consideration is very welcome.

In conclusion, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], my chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN], the subcommittee ranking member, and my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], for their sponsorship of this resolution and their support in bringing this bill to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to support the peace process in Guatemala.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] for introducing this resolution and for his supporting remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that, despite the hectic and trend-setting legislative pace, we have found the time today to take up House Concurrent Resolution 17 to congratulate the people of Guatemala on the establishment of the peace process for that nation.

After 36 years of civil war, Guatemala has finally had a chance for a lasting peace. The URNG has agreed to demobilize and in fact the first URNG combatants are entering demobilization camps this week. The Guatemalan military has agreed to reduce its size by one-third, and the United States has pledged \$265 million over 4 years for reconstruction.

Even before the signing of the peace accords, the human rights situation in Guatemala had improved dramatically as a result of the cessation of hostilities last March. The government of President Arzu has moved aggressively to restructure the military command by reducing the number of general officers from 23 to 8 and removing those officers alleged to be involved in corruption or other abuses. But there is still a long way to go.

Guatemala continues to suffer from a marked disparity in income distribution, and poverty is pervasive. According to AID, 75 percent of Guatemala's population live in poverty. Only 48 percent of its adults are literate, and its infant mortality rate is among the highest in Latin America.

Yet despite of all this, or perhaps because of it, Guatemalans have chosen peace and democracy. They are to be congratulated for that choice.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague and chairman [Mr.

GALLEGLY] for his great leadership in this area and for introducing this resolution, to our chairman [Mr. GILMAN] for his stewardship, and for our ranking member [Mr. HAMILTON] for his hard work on this resolution. I urge all of our colleagues to vote in support of House Concurrent Resolution 17.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of the resolution.

Let me join in expressing appreciation to the chairman of the committee [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. GALLEGLY], and the ranking member of the subcommittee [Mr. ACKERMAN], for bringing forward this resolution. My understanding is this is the first resolution coming from that subcommittee, and I commend them for it.

I am very pleased to cosponsor this resolution. It congratulates the people of Guatemala on the tremendous gains they have made in establishing lasting peace in their country. We are all aware that the path toward peace, as the gentleman from New York has indicated, has been a long one for Guatemala. It has required great patience by the people of that country. They have suffered horribly for 36 years under a very brutal civil war. It has required significant risks for peace, taken both by the Arzu government and the URNG leadership.

Signing the peace accords on December 29, 1996, does not by any means complete the peace process in Guatemala. Guatemala faces very considerable obstacles in consolidating peace and a democracy that respects human rights. I am especially encouraged by the language in this resolution that pledges continued United States assistance to the peace process there.

We are clearly dedicated to this process. We have already provided \$15 million in support for the Guatemalan economy, and five United States personnel will be in Guatemala with the U.N. peace observation force. I strongly support this resolution. I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana, the ranking member of our committee, for his remarks. I also want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] and the ranking minority member [Mr. ACKERMAN] for their work on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this measure. I think it is befitting for this House to recognize the extraordinary determination and sacrifice that has brought about the end of a war that has been raging for more than 35 years in Guatemala.

House Concurrent Resolution 17 acknowledges that Guatemala is building

a new and a more democratic society under comprehensive peace accords signed on December 29, 1996.

From the earliest days of his term, President Alvaro Arzu has shown exceptional courage and strong leadership in purging corrupt officers and suspected human rights violators from Guatemala's security forces.

His willingness to confront these problems has won him the confidence of the people of Guatemala that was necessary to pursue a firm and lasting peace accord with the leftist insurgency. President Arzu built on the foundation laid by his predecessor, President Ramiro de Leon, with two central objectives: to end the war and make Guatemala a more just country for all of its people.

Today, President Arzu's government has moved swiftly to form commissions responsible for implementing specific agreements on economic, political, and cultural reforms.

Demobilization of the URNG guerrillas is one of the most important short-term tasks. Just this week, guerrillas have begun to voluntarily surrender their weapons to U.N. observers. International donors, including the United States, are coordinating efforts to retrain and to resettle roughly some 3,000 guerrillas and their supporters.

The international community has pledged \$1.9 billion to help implement the broad peace accords by extending education, health care, and economic opportunity to all Guatemalans. Our own Nation has pledged \$260 million over a 4-year period for these efforts.

Yes, much remains to be done to rebuild Guatemala's infrastructure and society. But we recognize today that the Guatemalan people have taken and are taking bold steps in the interest of peace, prosperity, and social justice.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by recognizing the contributions of our State Department and our Agency for International Development to the cause of peace in Guatemala over the years. Along with the United Nations, our diplomats and development specialists have made indispensable contributions to the peace process.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I once again commend Mr. GALLEGLY for his leadership on this subject. We look forward to working with him on these issues throughout the 105th Congress.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to those of my colleagues who have expressed congratulations to the people of Guatemala for ending decades of civil war and embarking on a courageous effort to rebuild their country together. The peace and national reunification that has resulted from this process represents the beginning of a bright new day for this country which has seen so much horror and loss in the past.

The civil war in Guatemala was one of the longest and bloodiest of this century. In the 36 years of fighting, the

fabric of Guatemalan society was torn apart. As the peace process takes hold, the people of Guatemala will have to begin the arduous work of recreating their society and repairing the institutions that must serve them in the years to come. It is my hope that resolutions such as this, and the positive role that the United States played in the peace process, will become the symbols of a new era of United States involvement in Guatemala. I believe that we have much to offer the people of Guatemala in their efforts to build democratic institution and refashion a civil society, and I hope that they will turn to us for help.

I continue to be concerned that, although the war has ended, the culture of impunity that has long plagued Guatemala remains. The Law of National Reconciliation established a general amnesty for war crimes, as well as a truth commission to help heal the wounds of war. We must do all that we can to see that those actions which fall outside the scope of the amnesty and the truth commission are prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Helen Mack, sister of Myrna Mack, who was brutally murdered by a Guatemalan death squad in 1990, is in town this week to discuss the application for amnesty made by her sister's killers. Such crimes do not fall within the parameters of the amnesty law, and we must press the Guatemalan Government to set firm limits on the amnesty provision in such cases.

We must also ensure that the truth commission is given the information that it requires to complete its healing process for the Guatemalan people. This means that the United States Government must fully declassify documents dealing with human rights abuses in Guatemala during the civil war. Given our own shameful role in this conflict, this is the least we can do to support Guatemala's peace process.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in urging the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 17 congratulating the people of Guatemala on the success of the recent negotiations to establish a peace process for Guatemala. This is an important statement of congressional support and the people of Guatemala should know of our interest and concern and support for their efforts in the peace process there.

Mr. Speaker, I join in congratulating the people of Guatemala on reaching a peaceful solution to the brutal civil war in which more than 100,000 people were killed over the past 36 years. In the violence, thousands of individuals were tortured, raped, and "disappeared." The frustrating and difficult U.N.-sponsored peace negotiations between the Guatemalan Government and the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union [URNG] were not quick, but they have brought an end to the violence.

At the same time, however, I wish to express my serious concerns regarding the sweeping amnesty provisions which were, ironically, dubbed the Law of National Rec-

onciliation. This legislation, which passed the Guatemalan Congress after only 2 days of consideration on December 18, 1996, raises some questions that I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. If misapplied, the Law of National Reconciliation, which followed the signing of the Peace Accords in Madrid on December 12, 1996, will not reconcile the people of Guatemala with government forces, but will plant the seeds of future suspicion and mistrust between the Guatemalan people and members of government agencies. I am concerned that the amnesty provisions could be used to open up a legal back door for human rights perpetrators to escape just prosecution.

The broad amnesty provisions are also in direct conflict with the March 1994 Human Rights Accord, one of the proclaimed milestones in the Guatemalan peace process. This accord required both sides to agree that the government would not sponsor measures designed to prevent prosecution of human rights violations. I urge the Guatemalan authorities at least to apply the minimum safeguards in the Law of National Reconciliation when prosecuting human rights violations. While providing amnesty for political crimes related to the armed civil war, article 8 of this law excludes cases of genocide, torture, and forced disappearances from the amnesty, as well as crimes for which amnesty is prohibited by Guatemalan law or Guatemala's international treaty obligations.

I am also concerned, Mr. Speaker, with regard to civil cases in which U.S. citizens are involved, which are not connected with the armed conflict. The Law of National Reconciliation could potentially be used to terminate the landmark cases brought against Guatemalan Government forces by U.S. citizens Helen Mack, sister of the slain Myrna Mack; Jennifer Harbury, the wife of Mr. Bamaca; Carole Denn, wife of Michael DeVine; and Sister Diana Ortiz. In addition, those few members of the military who have already been convicted in the DeVine and Mack cases could be released from prison. I hope the Guatemalan legal authorities will insure that all human rights perpetrators in Guatemala are brought to justice, and none of these cases will be terminated or suspended under the amnesty provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution today, but I also urge the Guatemalan Government to be certain that human rights violators are sought out and punished to the fullest extent of the law.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 17).

The question was taken.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING PEOPLE OF NICARAGUA ON DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS SUCCESS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) congratulating the people of the Republic of Nicaragua on the success of their Democratic elections held on October 20, 1996.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 18

Whereas on October 20, 1996, the people of the Republic of Nicaragua held truly democratic, multiparty elections to choose their government;

Whereas these elections were deemed by international and domestic observers to be free and fair and a legitimate expression of the will of the people of the Republic of Nicaragua;

Whereas on January 10, 1997, Arnoldo Aleman was peacefully sworn in to the office of President of the Republic of Nicaragua and immediately promised to continue down the path to democracy, national reconciliation and reconstruction that are started by the previous administration of President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro; and

Whereas this historic event of democratic elections in the Republic of Nicaragua and the inauguration of President Arnoldo Aleman should be honored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) congratulates the people of the Republic of Nicaragua for the successful completion of the historic democratic, multiparty elections held on October 20, 1996;

(2) congratulates former President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro for her personal courage and her commitment to democracy, which have helped her achieve a profound political and economic transition in the Republic of Nicaragua;

(3) encourages all Nicaraguans to work together after taking this critical step on the long road to lasting peace and democracy;

(4) recognizes that all Nicaraguans should continue to work together in order to ensure a stable democracy, respect for human rights, a free and market-oriented economy, and social justice for all people;

(5) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to help the Republic of Nicaragua move toward freedom and democracy; and

(6) further reaffirms that the United States is strongly committed to encouraging democracy and peaceful development throughout the Western Hemisphere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] the original sponsor of this resolution on Nicaragua.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I would like to rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 18. Mr. Speaker, we wrestle with problems both real and self-imposed in this Chamber day after day. It is nice for a change to be able to celebrate and to thank and to support one of our neighbors, which we are doing here not only with Guatemala but also now with Nicaragua.

I would also like to associate myself with my chairman the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], and also with the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], who have been cosponsors of this particular legislation.

This resolution really does three things: First of all, it congratulates the Republic of Nicaragua on holding free and fair elections for the second time in its history. Second, it recognizes the contributions of an extraordinary woman, the former President of Nicaragua, Violeta Chamorro, a person I call the great healer, who has had an impact far beyond the borders of Nicaragua. It also celebrates the peaceful swearing in of the new President, President Arnoldo Aleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have been associated with Nicaragua for several years. In 1988, a group of us from my district went down and established an educational program, all privately funded for this great country. I think we added a bit to the whole relationship between our countries at that time. This is before Violeta Chamorro was elected President.

Then in 1990, we went down and were there for the election. It was an extraordinary time. As I mentioned yesterday at the Committee on International Relations meeting, I can remember, with Elliot Richardson, we were part of a United Nations team picking up a young woman and her baby who had walked 30 miles to vote and then was going to walk back, just because she felt this was such an important time.

Then in 1993, my wife and my grandchildren and others went down there to see, personally and on a personal visit, this extraordinary country and what has happened to it.

The Chamorro administration really did extraordinary things. I mean here is a lady who was not prepared for leadership. Her husband had been trag-

ically assassinated there. All of a sudden she developed this tremendous rapport not only with the people but also with the critical issues there. The gross domestic product when she took over, after 20 years, was lower than it had been in 1970. Hyperinflation of about 40,000 percent, imagine, think of it, 40,000 percent a year. And the foreign debt amounted to more than six times the value of the total gross domestic product. Far-reaching privatization programs, preventive health care, primary education changes, and an extraordinary story in this tiny little country, all due to the leadership and this wonderful ambience of an extraordinary lady, Violeta Chamorro.

The election took place. Over 80 percent of the people voted. It was not a perfect election, but the observers, both elected representatives and staff, felt it was a free and fair election.

Now, starting on January 10, there was a peaceful transition to President Aleman and the power of the presidency is now in good hands.

□ 1145

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues and hope others will join with us in congratulating the people of this extraordinary nation of Nicaragua on the success of their elections and wishing President Aleman the best in the years to come.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] for his support of this resolution and for his poignant remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution, and I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] for introducing House Concurrent Resolution 18, it congratulates the Nicaraguans on their elections last October, and also extend my congratulations to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN]. I commend also the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], for moving it through the committee so that we could take it up here today.

The October 1996 election was an exciting one for the Nicaraguans. In a country with an underdeveloped infrastructure and almost no transportation system, between 85 and 90 percent of the eligible voters participated. Not one but six ballots were cast in these elections, and for the first time a domestic election observation group oversaw Nicaraguan elections.

The Nicaraguan people clearly stated they want to continue the democratic transition that was begun in 1990. They deserve to be congratulated for their relatively young democracy. I am

pleased to support the resolution and I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, last fall the people of Nicaragua again chose the path of democracy by electing Liberal Alliance candidate Arnoldo Aleman decisively.

In the wake of their second free and fair election of the 1990's, Nicaraguans must move just as decisively to consolidate democracy and strengthen their civil institutions.

Nicaragua is on its way to recovery. With 3 years of economic growth, peace, and stability, the people of Nicaragua chose a candidate who emphasized economic reform and private sector-led growth as key planks in his platform. Nevertheless, President Aleman has his work cut out for him.

Nicaragua continues to have a precarious balance-of-payment position and is heavily dependent upon foreign assistance. Although the economy has grown recently, the country remains very poor, with a per capita income of \$470 per year.

Strengthening the rule of law was a campaign theme of the President, and he inherits a court system that has become a bottleneck as problems of crime and property disputes have proliferated. It is imperative for Nicaragua to address this question if foreign investors are to have any confidence in Nicaragua's future.

The United States and other donors have provided \$4 billion to Nicaragua since 1990, and for the coming fiscal year USAID has requested an additional \$22 million to deepen and expand the economic reforms and enhance the legitimacy of civil institutions.

The international community must continue to work with the Nicaraguans to help them along the path to prosperity. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution will provide a measure of moral support to Nicaraguans and encourage them to continue on the road that they have chosen.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] for sponsoring this resolution and his hard work and diligence in this area of the world; and also the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], our chairman on the subcommittee, for putting this legislation through our body; as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the full committee; and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who serves as our leader on this side.

I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVEGA. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to first express my appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. BALLENGER] for the opportunity he extended me to join a congressional delegation visiting our neighboring countries in the Central American region. It certainly has been a real educational experience for me to see how beautiful democracy works in these countries that we visited, including Nicaragua.

As a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 18, I certainly would like to commend our good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] as the chief sponsor of this legislation; and also the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]; and the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

I am also grateful to our senior ranking Democratic member of the full committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for being a chief sponsor also of this legislation; and our good friend, the ranking member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of visiting Nicaragua on January 10 for the inauguration of President Aleman. It was clear the people of Nicaragua are dedicated to the principles of democracy. The election was a success. Domestic and international observers declared them to be free and fair, and it was certainly a true expression of the desires of the voters and the people of Nicaragua.

It was a large voter turnout—the kind that we dream about having in the United States. The attempts by the opponents of the democratic process to sully the results of the process were unsuccessful.

I am also pleased, Mr. Speaker, by the development of institutions in Nicaragua that will help consolidate that country's democratic system. The Supreme Electoral Commission has successfully conducted a number of free and fair elections. For the first time there is a civilian Defense Ministry, run by a civilian Minister of Defense.

This is an exciting and critical time for the country of Nicaragua, and I am pleased that we are taking this opportunity to support this democratic country.

There are still many challenges for the Nicaraguans to overcome, however. It remains the second poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, and it faces an enormous challenge in resolving its property problems. The Nicaraguans have chosen to address these problems as a democracy, and that is a giant—and commendable—first step.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to show their support for this government by adopting this resolution com-

mending the Government of Nicaragua for this milestone achievement.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to also rise in support of this resolution. I had the honor and distinction of being able to travel to Nicaragua as an observer for the elections, and it was an experience that will have an impact on me for the rest of my life, to see the level of commitment, in terms of democratic process, in a country which was just described as a poor country in economics but not in spirit or in hope.

In our country, our turnout for elections is arguably only about 30 percent, if we include unregistered voters. Nicaragua's turnout in the election was anywhere between 85 and 90 percent of eligible voters—85 to 90 percent. And in part of the country people literally had to walk a day to vote. Over 50 percent of the country really does not have electricity, does not have a road system, by any comparison to anything in the United States, where people literally had to walk a day to vote, a day in one direction or several, 8, 10, 12, 14 hours in one direction, 14 hours in another direction. And they did it.

As has been described, Mr. Speaker, we are living in really a golden age of democracy in the Western Hemisphere, an age that seemed unprecedented or impossible a decade or two ago. Nicaragua is a shining example of that success. And the involvement of the Nicaraguan-American community throughout America, but particularly in south Florida, as part of that process, I think, has been very positive.

Again, I think this Congress is looking forward to working hand-in-hand with the new administration in Nicaragua towards a redevelopment of the country, to strengthen it and to assure that its economic and democratic systems will continue for all times.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the promoters of this resolution, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON]; obviously thank the two chairmen, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], for moving this forward.

I remember in great anguish what this House went through many years ago as we were witnesses to that great civil war in Nicaragua. For so many years many of us had followed the impact that that had upon those people.

I was also an observer, Mr. Speaker, to the elections in 1990. For the first time the Government of Nicaragua,

then led by Sandinistas, had an orderly transfer of power to the government of Mrs. Chamorro. I think we saw history taking place at that time.

So often we condemn nations for their prosecution, for their persecution, for the oppression that they have caused to their citizens, to their many people, because they have been led by dictatorships, by tyrants. I am happy today to acknowledge the new government of Mr. Aleman, the new democratic elections that have taken place there. I commend that government, and I want to say how important it has been for our country to have been a part of that.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we thank our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], for sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 18, commending the Nicaraguan people for their democratic elections and peaceful transition of power, and I am pleased to have been included as an original cosponsor of this measure.

I also want to thank the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], and the ranking subcommittee member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN], for their support of the measure.

Fifteen years ago, Central America, as we know it, was in turmoil, and at that time our Nation paid a great deal of attention to the region and invested extraordinary sums of money to try to bolster the democratic governments. Now we see a region living in peace and democracy. The American public can rightfully claim a great deal of credit for supporting our neighbors in their hour of need.

All of us will certainly acknowledge that the Central American people themselves deserve the utmost credit for an extraordinary democratic transition. In House Concurrent Resolution 18, the House recognizes the significant accomplishments achieved by the Nicaraguan people since the transition to the democratically elected government of President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro on April 20, 1990.

The climate of free expression has improved dramatically since the routine repression during the Sandinista regime. Nicaragua's national assembly is operating vigorously as a truly representative body. Political parties and civic groups are active there. Spirited public debate on political and economic policy has been unhindered.

In October 1996, as the gentleman from New York indicated, 80 percent of Nicaraguans participated in national elections. These citizens freely elected a new president and a vice president, national assembly members, mayors and city councils. On January 10 power was transferred peacefully from one

democratically elected civilian government to another.

Like his remarkable predecessor, President Arnaldo Aleman is committed to democracy, to respect for human rights, and to a free market economy. In short, Nicaragua has made great strides toward overcoming a history of dictatorship and civil war, and we are encouraged by President Aleman's strong commitment to policies aimed at revitalizing the agricultural sector, attracting foreign investment, and addressing chronic unemployment and poverty that still exists, particularly in the rural regions of past conflict.

We support his efforts to ensure that property rights are going to be fully respected in Nicaragua. We are also encouraged by his actions to ensure that a nonpartisan police force and a professional army will answer to civilian authority.

Mr. Speaker, by adopting this resolution, the House will recognize the historic contributions made by President Violeta Chamorro. Her tireless efforts to resist and overturn dictatorship make her a giant figure in our time. I am proud that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] has chosen to commend President Chamorro in his resolution as well.

Once again, I thank the gentleman from New York for this resolution. We also thank our colleague from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] for his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to acknowledge the good work of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] for his work in Central America over several decades. The commitment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] and his full partner, Mrs. Donna Ballenger, recognizes that peace and prosperity in Central America results in concrete benefits here at home.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 18.

The question was taken.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMENDING HON. WARREN CHRISTOPHER FOR EXEMPLARY SERVICE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) commending and thanking the Honorable Warren Christopher for his exemplary service as Secretary of State.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 4

Whereas Secretary Warren Christopher served as Secretary of State from 1993 until 1997, and maintained the tradition of that Office by representing the international interests of the United States with great dignity, grace, and ability;

Whereas Secretary Christopher, during his tenure as Secretary of State, engaged in more international travel than any other Secretary of State in United States history, reflecting his indefatigable commitment to advancing peace and justice, protecting and promoting United States interests, and preserving United States leadership in international affairs;

Whereas Secretary Christopher has played a key leadership role in United States foreign policy achievements, including ending the war in Bosnia, restoring an elected government in Haiti, and advancing peace in the Middle East;

Whereas Secretary Christopher served with distinction as Deputy Secretary of State from 1977 until 1981 and, among his accomplishments as Deputy Secretary, is credited with skillfully negotiating the release of American hostages in Iran;

Whereas Secretary Christopher has had a distinguished career in law and public service in California;

Whereas Secretary Christopher, born in Scranton, North Dakota, is one of North Dakota's most distinguished native sons and has always displayed the quiet strength and work ethic associated with the people of the Great Plains;

Whereas in 1997 Secretary Christopher leaves his position as the 63d Secretary of State; and

Whereas Secretary Christopher has earned the respect and admiration of Congress and the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress commends and thanks the Honorable Warren Christopher for his exemplary diplomatic service, and for his skillful and indefatigable efforts to advance peace and justice around the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief, and they specifically hone in on an extraordinary citizen of this country, Warren Christopher. Warren Christopher has held one of the most important jobs that any administration can offer, the Secretary of State. There are two words which symbolize this great man: One is integrity; the other is judgment.

Mr. Speaker, Warren Christopher has done us proud.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of the resolution.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the committee, for bringing forward this resolution.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 commends and thanks the honorable Warren Christopher for his exemplary diplomatic service. The Senate approved this resolution, as I understand it, by voice vote on January 22. It was reported by the Committee on International Relations on February 5.

I also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], who has worked hard on a companion resolution in the House, praising one of North Dakota's finest sons, and on the persistent efforts of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] to see that this resolution was taken up by the House. I also want to thank Chairman GILMAN for moving the resolution through the committee several weeks ago and for his efforts to see that the House considers it.

This is, of course, an excellent resolution. It allows us to publicly recognize the extraordinary public service of Warren Christopher. Secretary Christopher has represented the international interests of the United States with great dignity, grace, and ability. During his tenure in office, Secretary Christopher had an indefatigable commitment to advancing peace and justice, protecting and promoting U.S. interests, and preserving the U.S. leadership in international affairs. There have been many tough foreign policy decisions to make over the past 4 years.

To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I understand that each of us may have our differences with the administration and its foreign policy, but I think all of us have an interest in ensuring that individuals of the caliber, character, and integrity of Secretary Christopher continue to be attracted to the high calling of public service.

It is altogether fitting that we commend this remarkable man and his extraordinary service to this country. I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the service of Warren Christopher as Secretary of State. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking member, for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

Not all my colleagues may be aware that Secretary Christopher hails from my State, the great State of North Dakota. He was born in Scranton, ND, a town of less than 300 people in southwestern North Dakota. Although his family moved to California when Secretary Christopher was still a young man, we in North Dakota like to think that we had a part in instilling in him the values he displayed so consistently throughout his public career: honesty, humility, loyalty, and hard work. He is without question one of our State's most distinguished sons, and it gives me great pride to join with my colleagues in recognizing Secretary Christopher's public service.

Secretary Christopher's service to our Nation began during World War II as an ensign in the Naval Reserve assigned to the Pacific theater. Following the war, Secretary Christopher attended law school at Stanford University, after which he served as law clerk to Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. Warren Christopher later established a very successful private law career in Los Angeles from which he took leave to serve as Deputy Attorney General under President Johnson, then Deputy Secretary of State under President Carter.

In the role of Deputy Secretary, Warren Christopher negotiated the release of 52 hostages from Iran. For his work, President Carter awarded Secretary Christopher with the Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian award. As the 63d Secretary of State, Warren Christopher provided calm and capable leadership during one of the most significant transition periods in American foreign policy.

Among the Secretary's many accomplishments, I believe two deserve special recognition. First, Secretary Christopher helped bring an end to the brutal war in Bosnia. In the fall of 1995 when the parties to the Dayton talks were ready to call it quits and break off negotiations, Secretary Christopher's steely determination kept the sides together through an all-night session until an eventual agreement was reached. Only time will tell if lasting reconciliation and Democratic institutions will take hold in Bosnia, but the fact is that Bosnian children are not dying today under mortar fire and sniper fire, in large part due to Secretary Christopher's tireless efforts.

History may prove that the Secretary's most enduring legacy will be his efforts on behalf of peace in the Middle East. During his 4 years in office, Secretary Christopher made at least 24 trips to the Middle East. He was personally very well suited to the terribly difficult task of brokering a peace accord. He deliberately minimized his personal profile while persisting with a determined, intelligent, and evenhanded approach at facilitating the region's leaders' courageous path to peace.

While implementation of the peace process is not yet complete, Secretary Christopher deserves substantial credit for the extraordinary progress that was made during his years as our Secretary of State. Beneath Secretary Christopher's ever composed demeanor was an intense commitment to advancing peace and U.S. interests around the world. His tireless efforts are evidenced by the travel record he set in office: 758,152 miles. That is equivalent to more than 30 trips around the world. This selfless public servant has done his native State of North Dakota and his country proud.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution commending the good work of Warren Christopher during his years as our Secretary of State.

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the superior service that my constituent, I am very proud to be able to say that, former Secretary of State Warren Christopher has provided this country. Mr. Christopher is well known to most of us as a former Secretary of State. It should also be pointed out that he served as the Deputy Attorney General from 1967 to 1969, and the Deputy Secretary of State from 1977 to 1981. He was sworn in as the 63d Secretary of State on January 20, 1993. Under his leadership the State Department has worked to promote the security and prosperity of all Americans.

During his tenure, U.S. diplomatic leadership moved us closer to forging a circle of peace in the Middle East, produced a reduction in the nuclear threat, worked to integrate environmental issues into the core of our foreign policy, made strides to adapt NATO, and strengthened the partnership between the United States and Japan.

More important than these singular accomplishments is that for 4 years Mr. Christopher worked untiringly and consistently to represent us with grace and skill, traveling more miles than any previous Secretary of State. His dedication and his professional expertise are unquestionable. Now he has successfully passed off the torch to a shining star, Secretary Madeleine Albright.

Mr. Christopher, I am addressing you directly: Thank you for your dedicated

service, and I want to also say welcome home. I hope to see you soon on beautiful Padaro Lane, or on Santa Barbara Street in the community that both of us love.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they should address their remarks to the Chair and not to individuals directly.

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from California for his supportive remarks, and I am pleased to bring this resolution before the House today pursuant to the direction of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was adopted by unanimous vote in the Senate on January 22 as Secretary Christopher's distinguished tenure was expiring. I have had the pleasure of working with Secretary Christopher as ranking Republican and later as chairman of our Committee on International Relations during the past 4 years, and first knew him earlier in both our careers when he served in the Carter administration.

There is no question in my mind that Warren Christopher deserves our commendation for his outstanding, long record of significant service to our Nation. As Deputy Secretary in the Carter administration and then later as Secretary in the Clinton administration, Warren Christopher served his Nation in two administrations ably and meritoriously.

He has enormous respect for his colleagues in the State Department, and they returned that respect fully. A distinguished attorney, Warren Christopher favored a quiet approach to solving problems, keeping his eye on the ball, and, as one editorialist put it, he approached his job with "discretion approaching squareness."

Over the years we had some policy differences, but this is not the time to dwell on any of them. Rather, we celebrate today Warren Christopher's many achievements and join with the Senate in applauding them in this formal manner.

I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] in helping to provide the impetus for consideration of this resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 4.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate concurrent resolution just concurred in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1215

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. Doc. No. 105-51)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency declared on March 15, 1995, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701-1706) is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 1997, to the *Federal Register* for publication. This emergency is separate from that declared on November 14, 1979, in connection with the Iranian hostage crisis and therefore requires separate renewal of emergency authorities.

The factors that led me to declare a national emergency with respect to Iran on March 15, 1995, have not been resolved. The actions and policies of the Government of Iran, including its support for international terrorism, efforts to undermine the Middle East peace process, and its acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them, continue to threaten the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in

force the broad authorities that are in place by virtue of the March 15, 1995, declaration of emergency.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 5, 1997.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

□ 1302

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS) at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question de novo on the approval of the Journal and resume proceedings on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained, then on the motion to suspend the rules, postponed from Tuesday, March 4, 1997.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The Journal, de novo; House Concurrent Resolution 17, by the yeas and nays; House Concurrent Resolution 18, by the yeas and nays; House Concurrent Resolution 31, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business in the question de novo of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

CONGRATULATING PEOPLE OF GUATEMALA ON NEGOTIATIONS TO ESTABLISH PEACE PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 17.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr.

GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 17, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, answered "present" 2, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Herger
Ackerman	Davis (VA)	Hill
Aderholt	Deal	Hilleary
Allen	DeFazio	Hilliard
Andrews	DeGette	Hinchey
Archer	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Armey	DeLauro	Hobson
Bachus	Dellums	Hoekstra
Baessler	Deutsch	Holden
Baker	Diaz-Balart	Hooley
Baldacci	Dickey	Horn
Ballenger	Dicks	Hostettler
Barcia	Dingell	Houghton
Barrett (NE)	Dixon	Hoyer
Barrett (WI)	Doggett	Hulshof
Bartlett	Dooley	Hunter
Barton	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Bass	Doyle	Hyde
Bateman	Duncan	Inglis
Becerra	Dunn	Istook
Bentsen	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Bereuter	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Berman	Ehrlich	(TX)
Berry	Emerson	Jefferson
Bilbray	Engel	Jenkins
Bilirakis	English	John
Bishop	Ensign	Johnson (CT)
Blagojevich	Eshoo	Johnson (WI)
Bliley	Etheridge	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Evans	Johnson, Sam
Blunt	Everett	Jones
Boehert	Ewing	Kanjorski
Boehner	Farr	Kaptur
Bonilla	Fattah	Kasich
Bonior	Fawell	Kelly
Bono	Fazio	Kennedy (MA)
Borski	Fliner	Kennedy (RI)
Boswell	Flake	Kennelly
Boucher	Foglietta	Kildee
Boyd	Foley	Kilpatrick
Brady	Forbes	Kim
Brown (FL)	Ford	Kind (WI)
Brown (OH)	Fowler	King (NY)
Bryant	Fox	Kingston
Bunning	Frank (MA)	Klecza
Burr	Franks (NJ)	Klink
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Klug
Buyer	Frost	Knollenberg
Callahan	Furse	Kolbe
Calvert	Gallegly	Kucinich
Camp	Ganske	LaFalce
Campbell	Gejdenson	LaHood
Canady	Gekas	Lampson
Cannon	Gephardt	Largent
Capps	Gibbons	Latham
Cardin	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Castle	Gillmor	Lazio
Chambliss	Gilman	Leach
Chenoweth	Gonzalez	Levin
Christensen	Goode	Lewis (CA)
Clay	Goodlatte	Lewis (GA)
Clayton	Goodling	Lewis (KY)
Clement	Gordon	Linder
Coble	Goss	Lipinski
Coburn	Graham	Livingston
Collins	Granger	LoBlundo
Combest	Green	Lofgren
Condit	Greenwood	Lowey
Conyers	Gutierrez	Lucas
Cook	Gutknecht	Luther
Costello	Hall (OH)	Maloney (CT)
Cox	Hall (TX)	Maloney (NY)
Coyne	Hamilton	Manton
Cramer	Hansen	Manzullo
Crane	Harman	Markey
Crapo	Hastert	Martinez
Cubin	Hastings (FL)	Mascara
Cummings	Hastings (WA)	Matsui
Cunningham	Hayworth	McCarthy (MO)
Danner	Hefley	McCarthy (NY)
Davis (FL)	Hefner	McCollum

McCrery Pombo
McDade Pomeroy
McDermott Porter
McGovern Portman
McHale Poshard
McHugh Price (NC)
McInnis Pryce (OH)
McIntosh Quinn
McIntyre Radanovich
McKeon Ramstad
McKinney Rangel
McNulty Regula
Meehan Reyes
Meek Riggs
Menendez Riley
Metcalf Rivers
Mica Roemer
Millender-Rogers
McDonald Rogers
Miller (CA) Rohrabacher
Miller (FL) Ros-Lehtinen
Minge Rothman
Mink Roukema
Moakley Roybal-Allard
Mollinari Royce
Mollohan Rush
Moran (KS) Ryun
Moran (VA) Sabo
Morella Salmon
Murtha Sanchez
Myrick Sanders
Neal Sandlin
Nethercutt Sanford
Neumann Sawyer
Ney Saxton
Northup Scarborough
Norwood Schaefer, Dan
Nussle Schaffer, Bob
Oberstar Schumer
Obey Scott
Oliver Sensenbrenner
Ortiz Serrano
Owens Sessions
Oxley Shadegg
Packard Shaw
Pallone Shays
Pappas Sherman
Pascarell Shimkus
Pastor Shuster
Paxon Sisisky
Payne Skaggs
Pease Skeen
Pelosi Skelton
Peterson (MN) Slaughter
Peterson (PA) Smith (MI)
Petri Smith (NJ)
Pickering Smith (OR)
Pickett Smith (TX)
Pitts Smith, Adam

Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

CONGRATULATING PEOPLE OF NICARAGUA ON DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS SUCCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 18.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 18, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, answered "present" 3, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Billbray
Billirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Billie
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle

Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing

Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingilis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon

McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascarell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts

Saxon

Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Barr Paul
NOT VOTING—14

Brown (CA)
Carson
Chabot
Clyburn
Cooksey

DeLay
Dreier
Lantos
Nadler
Parker

Rahall
Schiff
Strickland
Wise

Mr. LIVINGSTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Barr Chenoweth Paul

NOT VOTING—12

Brown (CA)
Carson
Chabot
Cooksey

Dreier
Lantos
Nadler
Parker

Rahall
Schiff
Strickland
Wise

□ 1338

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGARDING THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 31.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANDY] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 31, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 295, nays 125, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—295

Aderholt	Coburn	Gordon
Allen	Collins	Goss
Archer	Combest	Graham
Armey	Condit	Granger
Bachus	Cook	Green
Baesler	Costello	Greenwood
Baker	Cox	Gutknecht
Ballenger	Cramer	Hall (OH)
Barcia	Crane	Hall (TX)
Barr	Crapo	Hamilton
Barrett (NE)	Cubin	Hansen
Barrett (WI)	Cunningham	Hastert
Bartlett	Danner	Hastings (WA)
Barton	Davis (FL)	Hayworth
Bass	Davis (VA)	Hefley
Bateman	Deal	Hefner
Bereuter	DeLay	Herger
Berry	Diaz-Balart	Hill
Bilbray	Dickey	Hilleary
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Hinojosa
Bishop	Doyle	Hobson
Blagojevich	Duncan	Hoekstra
Bliley	Dunn	Holden
Blunt	Ehlers	Hooey
Boehner	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Bonilla	Emerson	Houghton
Bono	English	Hoyer
Borski	Ensign	Hulshof
Boucher	Eshoo	Hunter
Boyd	Etheridge	Hutchinson
Brady	Everett	Hyde
Brown (OH)	Ewing	Inglis
Bryant	Farr	Istook
Bunning	Fawell	Jenkins
Burr	Flner	John
Burton	Flake	Johnson (CT)
Buyer	Foley	Johnson (WI)
Callahan	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Ford	Jones
Camp	Fowler	Kanjorski
Campbell	Fox	Kasich
Canady	Franks (NJ)	Kelly
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Capps	Gallegly	Kim
Cardin	Ganske	King (NY)
Castle	Gekas	Kingston
Chambliss	Gibbons	Klink
Chenoweth	Gilchrest	Klug
Christensen	Gillmor	Knollenberg
Clement	Goode	Kolbe
Clyburn	Goodlatte	LaFalce
Coble	Goodling	LaHood

Lampson	Paul	Skelton
Largent	Paxon	Smith (MI)
Latham	Pease	Smith (NJ)
LaTourette	Peterson (MN)	Smith (OR)
Lazio	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Leach	Pickering	Smith, Linda
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Snowbarger
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Solomon
Linder	Pomeroy	Souder
Lipinski	Portman	Spence
Livingston	Poshard	Spratt
LoBlundo	Price (NC)	Stabenow
Lucas	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
Maloney (CT)	Quinn	Stenholm
Manton	Radanovich	Stump
Manzullo	Ramstad	Stupak
Mascara	Regula	Sununu
McCollum	Reyes	Talent
McCrery	Riggs	Tanner
McDade	Riley	Tauzin
McHale	Roemer	Taylor (MS)
McHugh	Rogan	Taylor (NC)
McInnis	Rogers	Thomas
McIntosh	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
McIntyre	Ros-Lehtinen	Thune
McKeon	Roukema	Tiahrt
Metcalf	Royce	Towns
Mica	Rush	Trafigant
Miller (FL)	Ryun	Turner
Minge	Salmon	Upton
Molinari	Sanchez	Visclosky
Mollohan	Sandlin	Walsh
Moran (KS)	Sanford	Wamp
Moran (VA)	Saxton	Watkins
Murtha	Scarborough	Watts (OK)
Myrick	Schaefer, Dan	Weldon (FL)
Nethercutt	Schaffer, Bob	Weldon (PA)
Neumann	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Ney	Sessions	White
Northup	Shadegg	Whitfield
Norwood	Shaw	Wicker
Nussle	Shays	Wolf
Obey	Shimkus	Wynn
Ortiz	Shuster	Young (AK)
Oxley	Siskis	Young (FL)
Packard	Skeen	
Pappas		

NAYS—125

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Neal
Ackerman	Harman	Oberstar
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Baldacci	Hilliard	Owens
Beocerra	Hinchey	Pallone
Bentsen	Horn	Pascrell
Berman	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Boehlert	(TX)	Pelosi
Bonior	Jefferson	Pickett
Boswell	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Kennedy (MA)	Rothman
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kennelly	Sabo
Coyers	Kilpatrick	Sanders
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Sawyer
Cummings	Klecza	Schumer
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Scott
DeFazio	Levin	Serrano
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Delahunt	Lofgren	Skaggs
DeLauro	Lowey	Slaughter
Dellums	Luther	Smith, Adam
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Snyder
Dicks	Markey	Stark
Dingell	Martinez	Stokes
Dixon	Matsui	Tauscher
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson
Dooley	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Edwards	McDermott	Tierney
Engel	McGovern	Torres
Evans	McKinney	Velázquez
Fattah	McNulty	Vento
Fazio	Meehan	Waters
Foglietta	Meek	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Menendez	Waxman
Frost	Millender	Wexler
Furse	McDonald	Weygand
Gedensson	Miller (CA)	Woolsey
Gephardt	Mink	Yates
Gilman	Moakley	
Gonzalez	Morella	

NOT VOTING—12

Carson	Lantos	Rahall
Chabot	Nadler	Schiff
Cooksey	Parker	Strickland
Dreier	Porter	Wise

□ 1350

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. FROST changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent from rollcall vote 31. Had I been present on that vote I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, due to flooding in my District, I was with Vice President Gore and local officials to discuss the flood this morning in Kenova, WV. Due to weather, my flight to Washington was canceled and I unavoidably missed RECORD votes numbered 29, 30, and 31.

On Rollcall vote No. 29, House Concurrent Resolution 17, congratulating the people of Guatemala on negotiations for a peace process, I would have voted "yes" had I been present.

On Rollcall vote No. 30, House Concurrent Resolution 18, congratulating the people of Nicaragua on the success of their democratic elections, I would have voted "yes" had I been present.

On Rollcall vote No. 31, House Concurrent Resolution 31, a sense of Congress that Ten Commandments can be displayed in Government buildings, I would have voted "yes" had I been present.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 82) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Science: Mr. English of Pennsylvania; Mr. Nethercutt; Mr. Coburn; and Mr. Sessions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MCINNIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the 5-minute special order granted today to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INFORMING MEMBERS OF THE PASSING OF H. EDWARD DREIER, JR.

(Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it saddens me to inform the House of the passing of a dear friend and constituent, Ed Dreier, who is the father of our colleague, the gentleman from California [DAVID DREIER].

H. Edward Dreier, Junior, was a pioneer in the housing industry in Kansas City. Forty-five years ago this month he incorporated his real estate development, construction, and property management business and began service on the first commission on human relations to implement integration laws for housing in our community.

One and one-half weeks ago, DAVID accepted for his father the Crystal Merit Award, honoring excellent in the apartment industry. Mr. Dreier was very active in the civic community, including serving as president and chairman of the Lyric Opera Company of Kansas City, and was an original member of the Westport Allen Center board of trustees.

He had many friends here in the House, from the gentleman from New York [CHARLIE RANGEL] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [JOE MOAKLEY] to his fellow marines, the gentleman from New York [AMO HOUGHTON] and [JERRY SOLOMON]. Our thoughts and prayers are with DAVID and his family during this most difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to pay tribute to this fine citizen whose contributions, through public service, will be remembered by those whose lives he touched.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD newspaper articles concerning Mr. Dreier's passing.

The material referred to follows:

AREA REAL ESTATE DEVELOPER DIES
(By Mark Davis)

H. Edward Dreier Jr. of Kansas City, an area builder and property manager, died Monday. He was 69.

Dreier founded his real estate development, construction and property management company 45 years ago in Kansas City. Dreier Management Co. built and continues to manage several area apartment buildings.

Dreier also was active in Kansas City's civic community, though he hadn't received much public notice for this work.

"He'll be badly missed by the Midtown community," said the Rev. Roger Coleman, executive director of the Westport Allen Center.

Coleman said Dreier was an original member of the center's board of trustees, formed in 1983. He also had supported its earlier efforts to buy and renovate an abandoned school.

The former school at 706 W. 42nd St. now provides an activity center and offices for many nonprofit groups, including the State Ballet of Missouri and Narcotics Anonymous.

"He loved the tenants here like he loved the tenants in his apartments down the street," Coleman said. "It sounds selfish, but we had such plans for him."

Coleman said Dreier stood out even among the other board members. Dreier not only raised money but also participated in the center's activities and made himself available when Coleman called for help.

Dreier also was president of the board of directors of the Lyric Opera of Kansas City in its 1981-82 season and served on the board since 1976.

Last month, Dreier received the Crystal Merit Award from the Apartment Association of Kansas City. The award honored Dreier as the area's best property supervisor for 1996.

Dreier's health kept him from the Feb. 21 award ceremony and his son, U.S. Rep. David Dreier of California, accepted the award. David Dreier said he plans to become more involved in the company and believed his mother also would take a greater role.

"Public service was always a priority for him," said David Dreier, noting that his father had served on Kansas City's first commission on human relations in the 1950s.

Survivors include his wife, Joyce Yeomans Dreier, of the home; his son, David Dreier, San Dimas, Calif.; daughters, Denise Dreier Despars, Hermosa Beach, Calif., and Dana Dreier Lamont, Aurora, Ill.; a sister, Carolee Atha, Mission Hills; and two grandchildren.

Services will be at 2 p.m. Thursday at Stine & McClure Funeral Home at 3235 Gillham Plaza. No burial services are planned.

H. EDWARD DREIER, JR.

H. Edward Dreier, Jr., Kansas City, MO, passed away Monday, March 3, 1997. Memorial services will be held at 2 p.m. Thursday, March 6, at D.W. Newcomer's Sons Stine & McClure Chapel, 3235 Gillham Plaza, Kansas City, MO. In lieu of flowers, the family requests memorial contributions be made to a charity of the donor's choice.

Mr. Dreier attended Pembroke Hill School, Kemper Military Academy, and graduated from Southwest High School in 1946. He was a drill instructor with the U.S. Marine Corps, and graduated in 1952 from Claremont McKenna College, Claremont, CA. He was President of H.E. Dreier, Jr., Inc., a real estate development and property management firm. In 1953, he was appointed by H. Roe Bartle to the Commission on Human Relations. He served as President of the Great Oaks Nursing Home. He also served on the Planning Commission of Fairway, KS, and the Executive Committee of the Sixth Church of Christ, Scientist. He was an officer of the Homebuilders of Greater Kansas City, and was a 45-year member of the Real Estate Board; President of the Lyric Opera Board; Honorary Coach for the NAIA Tennis Tournament; and a member of the Society of Fellows of the Nelson Atkins Museum. Mr. Dreier was a Director of United Missouri Bank, North Region; President of the Dreier

Family Foundation; and served on the Executive Committee of the Westport Allen Center. He was a Paul Harris Fellow and Secretary/Treasurer of Rotary Club 13, and a member of the Vanguard Club and Carriage Club. On February 21, 1997, he received the Crystal Merit Award, honoring excellence in the apartment industry for the midwest. In Rancho Mirage, CA, he was a member of the Thunderbird Country Club. The Club at Morningside, and a Patron of the Friends of the Los Angeles Philharmonic and the Desert Museum. He is survived by his wife, Joyce Yeomans Dreier; a son, Congressman David Dreier, Los Angeles; two daughters, Denise Dreier Despars, Hermosa Beach, CA, and Dana Dreier Lamont, Aurora, IL; and two granddaughters, Leslie LaRue Lamont and Lisa Lee Lamont. (Arrangements: D.W. Newcomer's Sons Stine & McClure Chapel)

□ 1400

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MISES REDISCOVERED IN UNLIKELY SETTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to proudly announce the recovery of a momentous treasure formerly believed to be lost to humankind in the noble cause of individual liberty. When German tanks rolled through Vienna in 1938, Hitler's national police force made a stop at the apartment of one of history's greatest intellectual defenders of liberty, an intellectual hero who had recently vacated his apartment to escape the fascist tirade of the corporate statist. Upon ransacking the vacant apartment, the national police removed 38 boxes of intellectual manuscripts containing a detailed analysis of why fascism, democratic-socialism, communism, and various other forms of collectivism necessarily contains the seeds of its own respective destruction.

It is a pinnacle of irony that for nearly 60 years these treasures, believed to have been confiscated and destroyed by a system totally devoid of individual liberty and due process, were located in the Soviet Union. The genuine irony is that these manuscripts were rediscovered only as a consequence of the Soviet experiment's ultimate failure, a failure deduced within those same manuscripts as the logically necessary outcome of collectivism.

The great hero of liberty and author of these manuscripts is the Austrian economist Ludwig Von Mises. I proudly and respectfully request entry in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this compelling story as told by Llewellyn Rockwell, President of the institute that currently bears Dr. Mises' name.

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 2, 1997]

MISES REDISCOVERED IN UNLIKELY SETTING

(By Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.)

The American conservative tradition was once rooted in serious thought and great scholarship—as hard as that may be to believe today. In constitutional law, it stood for strict construction; in philosophy, it stood with the scholastics; and in economics, it stood with the Austrian School and Ludwig von Mises.

Now comes remarkable news. A massive collection of Mises's personal papers have been recovered in an archive in, of all places, Moscow, where they rested for the duration of the Cold War. They were discovered by two Austrian scholars—a Sovietologist from the University of Graz and a historian from the University of Vienna—and what they've found may change the way we look at modern times.

Mises came to New York in 1940, one of a generation of Austrian intellectuals forced to flee the Nazi onslaught. He had not come here to retire. This man of 60 would work for more than three decades to revivify the passion for liberty in this country, through passionate teaching and writing for scholarly and popular audiences.

His central message was contrary to all the fashions of the day. Mises taught that the free market is the key to civilization, and that socialism of all sorts, including the democratic and Keynesian varieties, must be fiercely resisted.

In those days, immigrants saw acculturation as their first responsibility, so it didn't take long for Americans to think of Mises as their own. In 1949, his great work, *Human Action*, appeared—a thousand-page treatise that surpasses any previous work in free-market theory. Though German was his first language, Mises wrote his book, still in print, in beautiful English.

It's easy to forget Mises' extraordinary life before he emigrated here. In 1912, he wrote a book on money and banking that set the European academic world on fire. At the dawn of the central banking age, he claimed money management actually destabilizes the economy by fueling inflation and business cycles.

In 1919, he forecast a European political explosion. He said it would stem from two sources: the failure of Versailles to settle the nationalities issue, and the rise of statism all over the Continent. In 1923, he tore the hide off socialist doctrine with a treatise—still unsurpassed—exposing the social, political and economic consequences of collectivism.

He followed up in 1927 with a full-blown defense of the classical liberal society, in which the economy is free of government involvement, private property is sacrosanct, the only role of the military is defending the country's borders, and citizens enjoy full freedom of speech and association.

All the while, he led a famous seminar attended by the best minds in Europe. He taught at the University of Vienna. He was chief economist for the Austrian Chamber of Commerce, where he defended capitalism against socialists national and international. He founded and administered a think tank devoted to solving the supposed mystery of the business cycle.

Yet a few years later, the entire Continent would be darkened by the specter of totali-

tarism. Even in America, the 19th-century ideal of free trade and decentralized government was widely seen as outmoded and unworkable. Mises began to see himself as the last of classical liberals.

More devastating for him was the loss of all his files in Vienna, both personal and academic. He had been keeping them from his early schooling until just before he left to teach in Geneva, a safe harbor for dissident and Jewish intellectuals of the day.

When German tanks rolled into Vienna in 1938, the police made a stop of Mises' apartment, and looted 38 boxes filled with his precious papers, notes and manuscripts, and carted them away. Until recently, everyone assumed they were destroyed, and with them a good part of Austrian intellectual history.

Fast forward 53 years, as the Soviet Union unraveled and the veil of secrecy began to rise. Moscow's massive archival holdings were opened for the first time, partly because of a desperate search for something to sell in exchange for hard currency.

Stefan Karner and Gerhard Jagschitz found in them what they had long sought, and the irony is bracing. The voluminous papers of Mises, the century's leading opponent of statism, reappear only after the world sees that he had been absolutely right. In this man's life is the story of modern times; in his work are the keys to understanding its bloody errors. Now, his papers rediscovered, it's time to rediscover his wisdom.

TEN COMMANDMENTS ARE THE BASIS OF OUR LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, the House has just voted on a very interesting bill expressing the sense of Congress regarding the display of the Ten Commandments by Judge Roy S. Moore, who is a circuit court judge in the State of Alabama. The judge had posted the Ten Commandments on the wall of his courtroom as a remembrance and sign that all the laws in this Nation and, in fact all of the laws in the world as we know it, really come from the Ten Commandments, the Decalogue, which is the laws that were given to Moses.

Another judge in the same circuit in Alabama, in response to a lawsuit that was brought against Judge Moore, ordered Judge Moore to remove a copy of the Ten Commandments that hangs on the wall in his courtroom. The Alabama Supreme Court has decided to review the matter and has issued a stay allowing the Ten Commandments to remain on the wall of the courtroom during the pendency of the appeal.

How interesting it is that the U.S. Congress, that the House of Representatives should have to take a vote on whether or not it is lawful that a copy of the Ten Commandments be posted in a public building.

James Madison, who was the author of our Constitution, said: "We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of

government, but upon the capacity of the individual to govern himself, control himself, and sustain himself according to the Ten Commandments of God."

As one looks at this great Chamber, the House of Representatives, the people's House, the Chamber where Members of Congress from every State in the Union and from the territories come in order to do the people's business, one only has to look at the sculpture directly in front of the Speaker's dais and the sculpture is of Moses.

The reason for the picture of Moses in the Chamber of the House of Representatives is to give credence to the people speaking here that all of the laws that we enact have as their moral basis the Ten Commandments. In the Supreme Court itself, there are two versions of the Ten Commandments up on the walls.

Here we are in America today at this point in history where we have to defend the posting of the Ten Commandments on the wall of the chambers of a judge who looks upon those Ten Commandments in the historical aspect that this is the basis of all of our laws. After all, the reason it is against the law to steal is that this was listed in the Ten Commandments, Thou shall not steal.

As a person goes over to the Jefferson Memorial and stands inside that beautiful building, if he stands right in front of Mr. Jefferson, turns his back and looks in the same direction as Mr. Jefferson, immediately to Jefferson's right, the first tablet says very simply: "Can the liberties of a Nation be thought secure if it has removed so firm a conviction that our liberties are the gift of God?"

As Jefferson and Madison and all of the authors of the Constitution, and Blackstone, and the people who gave rise to the great common and statutory law in this country have observed for years and years and years, it is based upon the law of Moses, it is based upon the Judeo-Christian doctrines that gave rise to our very freedom in this country.

So it is with sadness that we have to reach that point in America where one judge orders another judge to remove a copy of the Ten Commandments from the walls of that judge's chamber. But I am proud today that the people have spoken through the Members of the House of Representatives who have voted today in a majority to commend Judge Moore for having the courage and having the faith to show that he believes, as most Americans do, that the Ten Commandments are the basis of American law.

IN HONOR OF THREE TEXAS LEGENDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and even greater pride that I rise today to honor three Texas legends who are well on their way to becoming American legends.

Last week millions of Americans turned out in Madison Square Garden to witness the 1997 Grammy Awards. Those awards are given annually to those in the music industry who set the pace. The artists who win these awards are the very best. So as a lifelong resident, a former mayor and now a Congresswoman from Fort Worth, I am enormously proud to honor 3 hometown heroes who stole the show last week in New York.

By now, most of America has fallen in love with 14-year-old singing sensation LeAnn Rimes. Born on August 28, 1982, LeAnn Rimes began singing before she was 2 years old. At age 5, she won her first singing competition. At age 6, her family moved to Texas, where country music is an obsession. Needless to say, LeAnn fit right in.

Before long, she was making herself very well-known in the country music capital of Texas, Fort Worth. By the time she was 8, she was a regular on Fort Worth's favorite show, "Johnnie High's Country Music Review." This is a wonderful country music extravaganza which my good friend Johnnie High has run for years. Suffice it to say, the folks over at Johnnie High's were very impressed with the young singer, so impressed that word spread throughout the Fort Worth community and beyond.

Pretty soon LeAnn was a regular at the Dallas Cowboy football games, where she sang the Star Spangled Banner in front of Troy, Emmitt and 60,000 fans. When LeAnn turned 11, she recorded her first album entitled "All That." The album included a song called "Blue," which was written by another long time Fort Worth great, discjockey Bill Mack.

Bill had originally intended the song for Patsy Cline, but she died tragically before she could record it some 30 years ago. How proud Patsy Cline would be today to know that young LeAnn Rimes sang this special song for her.

So, Mr. Speaker, it was altogether fitting and appropriate that Mack was honored for Best Song for "Blue" and LeAnn was honored as Best Female Country Artist, as well as best new artist in any category.

Shortly after the awards program ended, LeAnn was asked at a press conference how she planned to celebrate her awards. "I guess I will go out to dinner," she said. "I am too young to do anything else." Well, LeAnn, you are certainly not too young to be on a

one-way ticket to success. Congratulations to you, LeAnn, and to Bill. We are very proud of you.

But Fort Worth's country stars were not the only ones to shine last week. Fort Worth is also the home of some of the most inspirational gospel music in the world. It was in the pews of these churches that Kirk Franklin honed his talents for singing gospel music.

Kirk was born and raised in Fort Worth. Abandoned by his teenage mother and father at the age of 3, the orphaned Franklin was adopted by an aunt. At age 4, Kirk began to play the piano, and by the time he was in kindergarten, he was a regular on the local gospel music circuit. At age 19, he was recording in the studio.

In the early 1990's, gospel fans all over America got the chance to hear what those of us in Fort Worth had been enjoying for years, the amazing, soulful voice of Kirk Franklin. A month after the release of his 1993 album, "Kirk Franklin and the Family," the album was No. 1. In fact, Kirk's initial album marked the first time in the history of gospel music that a debut album sold over 1 million copies. In just 4 short years, Kirk Franklin has become a musical superstar carrying his message of grace, hope, and love to the whole world.

Last fall, a tragic accident on stage almost ended Kirk's career. After falling off the stage and into the orchestra pit, Kirk was unconscious for several hours. Doctors feared he might be paralyzed or even die. Instead, less than 2 months after the accident, Kirk was back on the road again. For his incredible moral courage as well as his indispensable music contributions, Kirk Franklin last week was awarded with a Grammy for Best Contemporary Soul-Gospel Album for 1997.

So on behalf of music lovers everywhere, but particularly on behalf of a proud hometown, I want to say congratulations to LeAnn Rimes, Bill Mack and Kirk Franklin. You have made your friends, your family and your Nation very proud.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the American people the examples of Bill, LeAnn, and Kirk. While all three of these talents come from different backgrounds and different environments, they are uniquely American. They have showed us all that achievement is based more on desire and determination than on situation and circumstance. They have taught us all that hard work is still the surest road to success.

AMERICA'S TECHNOLOGICAL SECRETS SHOULD BE SAFE-GUARDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today H.R. 400 passed through the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property of the Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 400, what I call the Steal American Technologies Act, is disguised as a patent reform bill.

This bill was first entitled, when it was first introduced last year, the Patent Publication Act. Well, people might ask themselves, how does the Patent Publication Act all of a sudden become a patent reform bill? Well, that is because the patent reform bill is a title that does not describe exactly what is going on in the bill, but the Patent Publication Act does.

This bill has not changed a bit. The purpose of the bill is exactly the same. Now, hold on to your hats, make sure you understand the magnitude of what is about to be said.

This bill, H.R. 400, which I call the Steal American Technologies Act, mandates that after 18 months, if an inventor in the United States applies for a patent, even if his patent has not been issued, after 18 months it is mandated that all the details of his patent will be published for everybody in the world to see and to steal. That is it. Every one of America's technological secrets will be mandated to be published so that those adversaries in Japan or in China or anywhere else in the world will have all the details and probably be able to go into production and use our intellectual property, all of our new ideas and technological discoveries against the United States of America.

That is why I call this the Steal American Technologies Act. It is beyond belief that this is going through the House of Representatives, but it will be on this floor unless the American people call their Congressman or Congresswoman to let them know how heinous it is to permit our adversaries to steal our technology and use it against us.

This is exactly what is going to happen, because the huge multinational corporations who would benefit from stealing our technology and not having to pay royalties are in an unholy alliance with our own big companies who do not want to pay royalties to American inventors.

The idea of course is, oh, it is going to happen anyway. These things would have been invented. You put an infinite number of inventors in a room with an infinite number of typewriters and eventually everything will be invented. No. We have had a strong and prosperous country because we have had the strongest patent protection of any country of the world. Now they are trying to change that, because they are taking away the confidentiality of American inventors, they are taking away our rights to a guaranteed patent term, and this H.R. 400 also obliterates the Patent Office.

□ 1415

That is right, Mr. Speaker. What this does, H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act also would take the Patent Office, which is written into the Constitution, and resurrect it. As what? A corporatized entity.

Our patent examiners are strong and faithful people, they work hard, and the reason they have been able to do a good job is because they have been government employees protected from outside influences. Now we are changing the entire rules of the game, just as America is entering into this new technological age.

Mr. Speaker, this is a Pearl Harbor in slow motion. This is a catastrophe that will hit our country and destroy our standard of living that is based on America being the technological leader of the world, and the American people in the future will never know what hit them. They will just say, wait a minute; did we not used to be the leader in technology? Could we not out-compete all these countries? That is because we had strong patent protection, and our Founding Fathers knew that as long as Americans had this patent protection, we would have the ideas and creativity to save our country.

I have a bill in opposition to the Steal American Technologies Act. My bill is H.R. 811, and there is a companion bill, H.R. 812. That is 811 and 812, which would restore to the American people their guaranteed right that has been part of our rights as Americans since our Constitution was written, for a guaranteed patent term, that is being attacked today, will be taken away from them.

My bill guarantees confidentiality, so when our inventors come up with new ideas, they are not going to go to our adversaries and be used against us. There is not going to be a line at the Patent Office for a copying machine, and a line over to the fax machine, and get it overseas as soon as possible.

H.R. 812, the companion bill introduced by the gentleman from California, DUNCAN HUNTER, will maintain in the U.S. Government a strong Patent Office and an efficient Patent Office to protect us and to make sure that our people are serviced well, which is a function, a proper function of Government.

This is an attempt to harmonize our law, and those who support H.R. 400 will tell us that we need to harmonize our law with the rest of the world. No, we need to strengthen the protections of the American people.

I ask for the support of my colleagues for H.R. 811 and 812 in opposition to H.R. 400.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION PREVENTING THE PURCHASE OR POSSESSION OF FIREARMS BY NONPERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the introduction of legislation by Representatives NITA LOWEY, CAROLYN MCCARTHY, and myself which would prevent the purchase or possession of a firearm by a nonpermanent resident alien. Unfortunately, this legislation comes too late to prevent the tragedy which occurred at the Empire State Building last month, when a man who had been in the United States for just 3 weeks shot seven tourists, killing one, and then killed himself. Such a violent crime under any circumstances is shocking but the fact that the gunman had been in this country for such a short time and had established residence at a Florida hotel was unbelievable. My colleagues and I have introduced this legislation in the hopes that we can prevent future crimes committed by individuals who are, essentially, tourists.

Current Federal law requires that legal aliens live in a State for a least 90 days before purchasing a firearm. I applaud the President's recent directive which strengthens the law by mandating that legal aliens must produce a photo ID and documentation to prove they have been in country for at least 3 months before purchasing a weapon. However, I fail to understand why a nonpermanent resident alien should be allowed to own a gun under any circumstances.

The Lowey-Engel-McCarthy legislation is very simple. If you are not a permanent resident of our Nation you quite simply should not be allowed to buy a gun. We must have strong comprehensive Federal legislation which prevents tourists from visiting our country to hunt down our citizens. The Empire State Building gunman was able to slip through the cracks of a system which does not adequately address the problem of violent criminal aliens. It now falls to us to ensure that our citizens are protected from violent predators who seek to abuse the laws of our Nation in order to harm law-abiding citizens.

DEFINING DEVIANCY, UP AND DOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, we just took a vote on the Ten Commandments and a controversy that is occurring in Alabama. I heard ridicule from a lot of Members saying, gee, is this the only thing that the House of Representatives can do? This is a trivial little matter. It is something that just does not really make a big difference.

But I am here to tell the Members that I think it is an extremely important thing we just voted on. If nothing

else, it shows there are a group of us that are ready to say enough is enough to the radicalism of the past 30 years. It has created a valueless void that I believe has torn down our civilization.

To reject the radicalism of the past 30 years, the first thing we have to do is recognize what has happened. We have had what has been called by many, defining deviancy down and defining deviancy up. To define deviancy up, what you do is try to make conventional behavior seem radical and radical behavior seem conventional, so just putting the Ten Commandments of God up on the wall in a courtroom in the United States of America is suddenly a radical, dangerous concept.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say to these ACLU members and to other Americans that would call that a radical notion, I would say to them, read the writings of James Madison. He, after all, is the father of the Constitution that these radicals claim to be protecting.

As he was drafting the Constitution, James Madison, the father of the Constitution, wrote:

We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of Americans to govern themselves, control themselves, and sustain themselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.

How can they claim that the Ten Commandments are a radical part of our heritage, and how can they claim that they must strip the Ten Commandments from public life to protect the Constitution, when the father of the Constitution and the fourth President of the United States of America said that American civilization's future is based upon this, as we are drafting the Constitution?

How could they say that when the father of our country, George Washington, in his farewell address, speaking to a young America, said: It is impossible to govern this country or any country in the world rightly without a belief in God and the Ten Commandments. How could they say it?

How could they say that a judge in the State of Alabama or in California or in Massachusetts has absolutely no right to decide whether the Ten Commandments goes on the wall, when our Framers said it was an issue that States could address?

We had Justice Joseph Story, who wrote one of the first commentaries on the Constitution for a sitting justice of the Supreme Court. He wrote that:

The whole power over the subject of religion is left exclusively to the State governments, to be acted upon according to their own sense of justice and the State Constitutions.

Thomas Jefferson wrote the same, saying that the 1st amendment and the 10th amendment combined left matters regarding religion to the States. Jefferson wrote, "Certainly no power to prescribe any religious exercise or to assume the authority in any religious

discipline has been delegated to the general government." It must, then, rest with the States.

I am sure many people, including some on the school board in my hometown, would consider radical the words of Abraham Lincoln if he said these words in our school system, where in my hometown a political set of guidelines has driven any mention of faith from the schools.

What would these radicals say to Abraham Lincoln's 1863 proclamation, while President:

We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other Nation has ever grown, but we have forgotten God. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

Is that radical? Were the words of Madison, the father of our Constitution, radical? Were the words of Washington radical? If so, Mr. Speaker, I admit, maybe some of us today are considered radical. We have to reverse what happened in 1947 with Everson, and rewrite what has happened.

ECONOMIC EQUITY FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce a special order that my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and I are cohosting for the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues. We are the cochair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, a bipartisan organization of the women Members of Congress, and in recognition of Women's History Month, we are holding a series of four special orders on four different subjects of great concern for women.

Today we turn to the issue of economic equity. I am going to start by talking about the contributions of women during Women's History Month in the area of our economy in today's world.

Women today are making an extraordinarily valuable contribution to all sectors of our economy, and in particular, to the dynamic growth of small businesses. Women are opening new businesses at twice the rate of men. Over one-third of all U.S. firms are women-owned businesses. These firms employ one of every four U.S. workers, and between 1987 and 1996, the growth of women-owned firms outpaced overall growth of U.S. firms by nearly two to one.

Women at all economic levels benefit from this dynamic growth. Women-owned entrepreneurial companies are providing women with more leadership

and management experience than they have had access to in larger corporations. These companies are leading the way in providing new benefits to employees, like more flexible work arrangements, tuition reimbursement, and profit-sharing. The likelihood of enjoying those benefits is far greater if you work for a woman-owned business.

What is driving this explosion of entrepreneurial enterprise by women? Not the need to integrate work and child care, but the desire and determination to control their destiny. Most do not work out of their homes to care for their children. In fact, it will surprise the Members to know that women with home-based businesses are no more likely to have children at home than are other women entrepreneurs. Most establish their business because they want to control their lives and control that balance between work and family responsibilities that is at the heart of satisfaction.

Current estimates put the number of woman-owned firms at 8 million businesses, contributing more than \$2.38 trillion in annual revenues to our economy. In Connecticut, over 80,000 women-owned business firms account for 30 percent of all firms in the State. Employment growth in women-owned businesses exceeds the national average in nearly every region of the country and nearly every major industry. Employment in women-owned firms rose by more than 100 percent from 1987 to 1992, compared to 38 percent for all firms. Women-owned firms employ a total of 18.5 million workers. The number of women-owned businesses is increasing in every State.

The top growth industries for women-owned businesses are diverse: construction, wholesale trade, transportation, communications, agribusiness, and manufacturing.

In addition to their dynamic growth, women have proven to be good business managers and are more likely to remain in business than the average U.S. firm. Nearly three-fourths of women-owned businesses operating in 1991 were still in business 3 years later, compared to two-thirds of all U.S. firms in the same period.

Women-owned businesses are also contributing to our global economy. As of 1992, and these are rather old figures, they are far better now, but these are the most recent we can count on, 13 percent of U.S. women-owned firms were involved in international trade. Globally, women-owned firms typically comprise one-fourth to one-third of the business population.

To what do we attribute this success? Of course, to women's creativity, determination, and willingness to work hard, but we as the Nation's leaders are also a reason for these phenomenal statistics. Government-developed programs, along with a growing base of successful women business leaders to

serve as mentors and role models are making a difference. As an example, the Small Business Administration Loans Program made loans to women in fiscal 1995 that accounted for 24 percent of the total loans made and 18 percent of the loan dollars loaned.

In particular, the SBA Microloan Demonstration Program awarded 43 percent of their loans to women. These loans averaged \$10,000 and are critical to budding businesses. One program in the SBA's Office of Women Business Ownership provides business skills training, counseling, mentoring, education, and outreach to America's women entrepreneurs. Since its inception in 1988, more than 60,000 women have benefited from this program through 54 nonprofit business centers in 28 States Nationwide.

Using Federal funds as seed money, business centers, after a 3-year period, must become self-sufficient. More than 35 centers are now entirely self-sufficient, and they are examples of true economic development, job-producing organizations that increase earning potential and are developing a large pool of skilled entrepreneurs.

Last year I introduced the Women's Business Training Centers Act of 1996 that would authorize this SBA Program to become permanent and increase its funding. I will be introducing that same legislation this year.

Other contributors to the growth of women-owned businesses include the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 which establishes a 5-percent government-wide procurement goal for women-owned businesses, and the Women's Requalification Loan Program which enables the SBA to prequalify a loan guarantee for a woman business owner before she goes to the bank.

□ 1430

Through these programs we have nurtured a dynamic resource for national economic growth. We need to continue that effort. There is more work to be done. Because despite their positive achievement, there are still areas of concern for women in business. These include the need for expanded access to capital, increased participation in Federal and private procurement markets, better access to training and technical support, greater access to affordable health care plans, a broader knowledge base about women-owned businesses. Women-owned businesses have become a key component of our national economic growth. And I know this body is going to be interested in and willing to support growth initiatives that the caucus will bring to our attention in the months ahead.

It is now my great privilege and pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], a woman of great leadership, enormous determination, passion, and intelligence.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, for her kind words, for her very hard work on behalf of women, for her bipartisanship and for her great intelligence and energy in this body. It is a great pleasure to commemorate Women's History Month, as a partner with my co-chair of the Congressional Women's Caucus.

This is the 20th year of the Congressional Women's Caucus, so Women's History Month this year means something very special to the 53 Members, who are women in the House of Representatives. It is a special enough occasion so that tomorrow the women Members will be going to the White House at 5:00 p.m. in order to commemorate its 20th anniversary with the President of the United States.

I want to indicate before I begin, Mr. Speaker, that my co-chair and I are only beginning this series. The second week of this series for Women's History Month will concern women in the military. That is an issue of great importance to the Women's Caucus this year, particularly considering the sexual harassment and sexual assault charges that have arisen at Aberdeen and other places.

The third week of March, the subject will be women's health. That is a very special matter for this caucus, since, I believe it is fair to say, the caucus can take much of the credit for advances that have come from this body on the issue of women's health. The gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] will lead us the third week of March on women's health. But where the gentlewoman from Connecticut and I begin is perhaps the place to begin this year discussing women and economic equity. The emergence of women in the workplace puts a burden on this body and on the American people to absorb this very large group with fairness and equity and equality.

The new woman is a woman who works. She is often a woman with children working part time. She is often a woman who works only after her children are in school. But it will be a rare woman of the coming generation that has not spent some time in the work force.

Last year, April 11, the President declared National Pay Inequality Awareness Day. That was the day on which a number of bills to encourage greater fairness toward women in the workplace were introduced. The reason April 11 was chosen last year is that was the day on which American women's wages for 1996, when added to their entire 1995 earnings, finally equaled what men earned in 1995 alone. This year I will be introducing the Fair Pay Act on that day. That is a bill I have introduced before and will introduce until there is more substantial progress for women in the workplace.

I also support a bill that has been introduced in the Senate entitled the Paycheck Fairness Act. The Paycheck Fairness Act will be introduced here in the House, and I intend to be a cosponsor. It is a far milder bill than the bill that I have written, the Fair Pay Act, and, therefore, it is a bill that I would hope most Members could embrace.

It will require greater penalties for violators of the Equal Pay Act. It will require the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to maintain payroll records by race, sex, and national origin even as it now maintains these records with respect to other terms and conditions of employment. And it will require the EEOC to train its employees in wage discrimination.

This bill is necessary because the notion of equal pay for equal work, embraced by virtually everyone in this body, is not getting the attention by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission it should get today, and there has been a decline in the number of cases. We think that the Paycheck Fairness Act and what it would encourage will increase vigilance under the Equal Pay Act.

Mr. Speaker, I was the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission during the Carter administration. As such, I enforced the Equal Pay Act and the other discrimination laws, including those that relate to pay. Out of that experience, it has become clear to me that we need the Equal Pay Act to be amended to do for women in the 1990's what the Equal Pay Act did for women in the 1960's.

The Equal Pay Act has been one of the most successful bills or one of the most successful pieces of legislation designed to offer equal opportunity ever passed by the Congress. It has in fact helped to narrow the gap between men and women in pay. But no one would stand in the well of the House and say, it has done its work or that it is as effective as this statute, the Equal Pay Act, could in fact be. Progress has been made but a great deal of that progress is sadly illusory.

Women's wages have now gone from 62 cents on a man's dollar, as was the case in 1982, to 71 cents on a man's dollar today. The problem with that progress is that it does not reflect straightaway progress for the average woman in the work force. The new presence of highly educated women in entry level positions accounts for part of that progress. But sadly, part of that progress simply shows up because men's wages have fallen so precipitously.

Why then is there a wage gap today? The wage gap persists largely because most women are still segregated in a few low paying women's occupations, pure and simple. If you got the opportunity to go to law school or business school or medical school, you are not among those women. But the fact is

that the average woman makes about \$14,000 a year, and that is because she works below her skill level in a women's occupation.

These occupations have stereotyped wages. They do not in fact pay in equivalency what a man would get in a job of equal skill effort, responsibility and working conditions.

The jobs may be dissimilar, but why should the pay be different if the skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions are the same?

For example, would anyone like to indicate to me why an emergency services operator, a female, dominated occupation, should be paid less than a fire dispatcher, a male, dominated occupation? There is no defensible reason for the disparity in their wages, but there is an easily ascertainable reason. And that is clearly that the wage scales have built in the fact of gender in the occupation. That is a problem that pervades the work force and pay levels.

My bill, the Fair Pay Act, would simply require that in the same workplace an employer pay men and women who are doing jobs of equivalent skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions the same, even if the jobs are not exactly the same.

This bill poses no threat to the way in which employers do business or the way in which our economy operates. The burden would be on the woman to show that her wage, the difference in her wage, for example, between the fire dispatcher and the emergency services operator, is not because of market conditions and supply and demand, but the burden would be on her to show that the reason for the disparity is discrimination based on sex. I am the first to indicate that not all women will be able to show that they earn less money than men in a comparable occupation because of gender discrimination. All my bill does is to allow those women who do the opportunity to show that they in fact are paid less than men because of their gender.

By now it is a truism that the decline in men's wages and the decline in the standard of living over a couple of decades as well have made work a necessity for the average husband-wife family. The growth in female heads of household, the return now or the entry now of welfare clients into the work force means that we must redouble our effort to make sure that women are paid what they are worth in the workplace.

The Fair Pay Act takes up where the Equal Pay Act leaves off. We have already seen in at least a half dozen States, from the State of Washington to the State of Connecticut, that one can enforce comparable pay discrimination without upsetting the economy of a State, for the State employment systems in those States have done exactly that.

To illustrate the currency of the issue of equal pay and comparable pay, let me finally cite the case of Marianne Stanley. Marianne Stanley is now coaching at Stanford. The sports aficionados will, of course, recognize who Marianne Stanley is. She was known especially for her work as head coach at Old Dominion, where she had a winning percentage of 351 to 146 during her stay there. The school won the AIAW titles in 1979 and 1990 and added an NCAA title in 1985 to her credits.

Until this season, by the way, when Tennessee's Pat Summit won her fourth national title, Stanley and Summit were tied for the most national women's basketball titles. Marianne Stanley has now brought an Equal Pay Act suit.

□ 1445

She brought that suit when she left Old Dominion, and she became head coach at USC, and she was there from 1990 to 1993. She was considered a national treasure, and led USC to the final eight of the NCAA tournament in 1992. Her teams, her Trojan teams, reached the NCAA tournament in each of her final 3 years there. This woman is a winner.

But she was fired following the 1992 season, reportedly because of a dispute with her athletic director over not receiving a salary equal to the salary that men's coaches were paid. She brought a lawsuit. That lawsuit is now on appeal.

Here is a woman who has broken through as coach in a sport where women got scant attention until recently, but as everyone knows, women's basketball is the coming sport, and here we have a champion in her own right who goes on to be a champion coach.

All I can say, without knowing the outcome of the suit that is on appeal, is that she was not paid the same as men's coaches. I do not think that one who won games the way she did should be subject to less pay than men's coaches who, by the way, had not, so far as I understand, won or had the championships as she had.

Equal pay and comparable pay issues abound in the workplace. This is the month to remind Americans of that. Too often we use commemorations like Women's History Month to congratulate ourselves for commemorating the fact of such a month. We must use these occasions to remind ourselves that there is work to do, and to then put that work forward.

My cochair has indicated that she will be using this month to introduce her bills. I will be using this month to introduce bills designed to help women. I hope that women in the caucus and our many colleagues throughout the Congress will use Women's History Month to focus on doing something for women that will have an effect on in-

creasing their opportunities in the work force.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, and we have next the gentlewoman from Texas, KAY GRANGER. This is Congresswoman GRANGER's first term as a Member of the House of Representatives. She was the distinguished and successful mayor of Fort Worth, TX.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in discussing the need for this Congress to help America's working women. It is particularly appropriate that the Women's Caucus is launching our weekly special orders by focusing on jobs and the workplace.

Today more than ever working women are no longer the exception, they are the rule. America's working women are redefining the workplace as we know it. Today women own nearly 6.5 million companies. That is one-third of all the businesses in America. By the year 2000 women will own 40 percent of America's businesses.

So it is vitally important that this Congress address the issues and the interests of this very growing segment of our economy. It is becoming increasingly clear that women's issues are economic issues. Jobs, taxes, and economic growth are the concerns of today's women.

Female entrepreneurs are here to stay. And while Washington cannot create wealth, we must at least ask our government to follow the first principle of the Hippocratic oath: Do no harm.

Government taxation and regulation and litigation hold back our working women. Government taxes prevent female employers and employees from keeping more of their hard-earned money, money needed for furthering their education, expanding their businesses and caring for their families. Today's taxes consume more family income than they spend on food, education, or shelter.

We need to make our tax system flatter and fairer so that our women do not have to work almost half the year to foot Government cost. Likewise, Government rules on litigation subject our small businesswomen to needless time and expense. Let us let our working women spend more time in the boardroom and less time in the courtroom through legal reform.

Mr. Speaker, today's working women are the pioneers of tomorrow. As they struggle to create new jobs, growth, and opportunity, let us make our Government work for our working women.

I would like to point out that many women work full time not only at the office but also in the home. In our efforts to enhance and encourage the careers of our women, I am afraid we have sometimes lost sight of the fact that many of our working women are

also working mothers. These working mothers need the opportunity to balance their schedules between work and home. After all, meetings with our children are just as important as meetings with our staff.

As a working mother of three, I understand there is no price tag on time with our loved ones. As a former mayor, I learned that comp time works in the public sector. Let us help our working women by giving workers in the private sector the same choice.

Mr. Speaker, the working women of America are essential to ensuring that our Nation continues on a path of economic growth and personal responsibility. I urge my colleagues to support measures which promote and protect the dual role of America's women as leaders at the office and leaders in the home.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the right to have written statements included in this special order from the gentlewoman from Indiana, JULIA CARSON, the gentlewoman from New York, SUE KELLY, and the gentlewoman from Maryland, CONSTANCE MORELLA, who have asked to submit such statements, as well as all Members.

I would also like to recognize the intention of a number of other women to participate in this special order; and while they have been detained, the gentlewoman from Florida, CORRINE BROWN, the gentlewoman from Texas, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, the gentlewoman from California, ZOE LOFGREN, and the gentlewoman from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY, had intended to participate, thinking that this would be earlier.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield once again to my colleague, Congresswoman NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for reading off names of Members who may want to now place matters into the RECORD. I believe she also read JULIA CARSON and KAY GRANGER. If not, I want to be sure their names were included. I am certain that there are perhaps even more Members who will want to add statements to the RECORD.

I thank the gentlewoman for acquiring this time and for sharing it with me.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Women's History Month and would like to call special attention to the progress U.S. women have made in the workforce.

Women have made inroads into spheres formerly dominated by men. For example, the number of female managers jumped from 19 percent in the 1970's to 43 percent by the middle of the 1990's. By 1993, women earned

a majority of all college degrees. Black women far exceeded their male counterparts, earning 63 percent of bachelor's degrees.

Unfortunately, these significant gains in the public arenas of school and workplace are matched by some sobering trends. Women and children are more likely to be living in poverty than men. Among the elderly, women's likelihood of being poor is twice that of men of the same age.

Under the new welfare reform law, poor and minority women will disproportionately suffer the impact of this legislation. For example, under the new law, unmarried women who have children while on welfare can be denied additional benefits for those children. With out-of-wedlock birth rates highest among blacks and Hispanics, this restriction will disproportionately affect poor minority children. In addition, the new law will exclude many immigrant mothers and their children from receiving food stamps.

In spite of these grim facts, I believe that women will achieve greater economic equity in the future. The movement toward greater equality in work and family roles can only be achieved over the long run by the succession of generations. Each generation must become more committed to equality than the last.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of Women's History Month and in tribute to the many women who, through the ages, dared to challenge injustice and discrimination in the workplace. It is the tireless work of those leaders who came before us that allow women to enjoy the benefits of the nineties. However, as we all know, those long distance runners for equality and social justice have not completed their course. During Women's History Month, we pause to reflect what we have accomplished in the past, and the work we must do for the future.

Women have made great strides in education and in the workforce. The majority of undergraduate and master's degrees are awarded to women, and 40 percent of all doctorates are earned by women. More than 7.7 million businesses in the United States are owned and operated by women. These businesses employ 15.5 million people, about 35 percent more than the Fortune 500 companies worldwide. And women are running for elected offices in record numbers. When I first came to the House in 1987, there were 26 women in the House and 2 in the Senate. In 1997, there are 53 women serving in the House, and 9 in the Senate.

While many doors to employment and educational opportunity have opened for women, they still get paid less than men for the same work. Full-time, year-round working women earned only 72 cents for each dollar a man earned in 1994. College-educated women earned \$11,000 less per year than college-educated men. College-educated women earned only \$2,000 more per year than white men who hold a high school diploma.

Although women are and continue to be the majority of new entrants into the workplace, they continue to be clustered in low-skilled, low-paying jobs. Part-time and temporary workers, the majority of whom are women, are among the most vulnerable of all workers. They receive lower pay, fewer or no benefits, and little if any job security.

Last year's Economic Equity Act, which I introduced along with my colleagues on the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, placed new emphasis on the economic impact of domestic violence. We are only beginning to understand the impact of domestic violence on American businesses. Domestic violence follows many women to work—13,000 attacks each year—threatening their lives and the lives of coworkers and resulting in lost productivity for their companies.

The economic problems of the elderly affect women in disproportionate numbers because women tend to have lower pensions and Social Security benefits than men. Pension policies have not accommodated women in their traditional role as family caregivers. Women move in and out of the workforce more frequently when family needs arise making it more difficult for them to accrue pension credit. Many must rely on inadequate Social Security earnings during their retirement years.

Last Congress, however, we passed the Homemaker IRA, which is a milestone in the struggle to achieve pension equity for women. Before the Homemaker IRA, women, and men, who worked at home as family caregivers could only contribute \$250 to an Individual Retirement Account [IRA]. This legislation ended the discrimination that many women face when they choose to stay at home and take care of their children. Allowing nonworking spouses to make full IRA contributions of \$2,000, just as their working spouses do, will help homemakers save for their retirement years.

Mr. Speaker, celebrating Women's History Month highlights the accomplishments of women and the need to open new doors in the future. But this special month would be meaningless if women's needs are forgotten during the rest of the year. We must continue to increase the workplace opportunities for women, which will benefit all Americans as we face the economic challenges of the 21st century.

CHILDREN'S ONLY HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to once again talk about the need for Congress to pass a children's only health care bill and the Republicans' continued refusal to let this Democratic plan move forward.

Again we are here in the middle of another week, in the third month of the 105th Congress, and the Republicans basically have nothing to do. Ten million American children have no health insurance, yet day after day after day the Republican leadership schedules no real business for the House of Representatives to consider.

Yesterday was a perfect example of just how little the Republicans have to do. Even though Democrats have legislative plans to provide health care to the Nation's 10 million uninsured chil-

dren ready for consideration, the Republican leadership decided it was more important to debate a symbolic measure about the Ten Commandments.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker, because it is really kind of unbelievable when one thinks about it. Instead of allowing legislative plans to ensure that all American children have health insurance to be considered, the House Republican leadership felt it was more important to consider a symbolic measure on how Congress feels about the display of the Ten Commandments in Government offices and courthouses.

The point is that children's health care, pure and simple, is something that needs to be addressed. The problem of uninsured children continues to grow as Congress watches from the sidelines. Indeed, last week I was joined by colleagues, some from New York, to discuss a report released by the New York City public advocate, Mark Green, that found a disturbing rise in the number of uninsured children in New York City.

As congressional Republicans continue to prevent the Federal Government from taking action to confront this problem, what is happening, essentially, is that various States around the country are trying to make some progress on the issue. An excellent example of such action was just published in an article about the action the State of Massachusetts has taken to implement a children's only health plan. This was in the New York Times on Friday.

I am pleased today to talk a little bit about that, because I think that the Massachusetts children's medical security plan, which is the name that is given to this proposal, is basically a good plan, designed to insure children whose parents earn too much money to qualify for Medicaid coverage but still cannot afford to purchase health care for their kids.

We have been through this before. If the family is eligible for Medicaid, then they have health insurance coverage. But we have a lot of people, working people, people that are on the job, in many cases both parents working at separate jobs, who do not get health insurance through their employer. They are not eligible for Medicaid because their income is not low enough, and so they simply go without health insurance for their children because they cannot afford to pay a premium that they would have to obtain privately or through some other means.

So basically what Massachusetts did was to try to come up with a plan to deal with those individuals who were above the income level for the Medicaid threshold but still do not get health insurance on the job for their children or who cannot afford to pay for health insurance privately.

The article in the New York Times details some individuals. For example, Mark Leary, of Lawrence, MA, was able to take his 3-year-old daughter to doctors to receive treatment for an ear infection even though the supermarket he works for does not offer health insurance.

It also talks about another individual, Paula Lincoln of Rockland, MA, who was able to still bring her children in to the doctor for checkups after she lost her teaching job.

It mentions another self-employed person, Elaine Choquette of Blackstone, MA, who uses the program to pay to bring her two sons to the doctors as well. Miss Choquette was quoted as saying, "I pay my taxes, and I never thought of it being anything compared to welfare."

This is not a welfare program. This is a program in the State of Massachusetts for working people. The program in Massachusetts is very much like many of the proposals that Democrats here in Congress have developed. Most of the programs awaiting consideration are like the Massachusetts program. They are designed to help hard working parents who make too much money to qualify for Medicaid yet still cannot afford health insurance for their kids.

The really big difference between the Massachusetts program and the various Federal programs awaiting consideration is that theirs has been enacted. In other words, the Massachusetts Legislature actually considers and passes legislation in response to societal challenges, and the Republican-controlled 105th Congress clearly does not.

The New York Times article on the Massachusetts plan reports that Representative BILL THOMAS, the California Republican who heads the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means, said in early February that he would soon hold hearings to get a sense of the scope of the problem of kids not having health insurance. But it is now March, and although we have debated the merits of hanging the Ten Commandments on the wall of Government buildings, I have yet to see a hearing on the issue held or a legislative plan examined.

□ 1500

Again, every day the Republicans waste is another day that parents have to endure the reality of being unable to take their children to the doctor. This is no small price to pay.

I have to say that the Massachusetts State Health notes that while uninsured children had always had access to emergency treatment, the State's health plan now allows parents to bring their children in for routine medical visits, check on immunizations, and tests for lead poisoning.

One of the points that we have been trying to make during this debate on kids' health insurance is that it may

very well be that in some cases, perhaps even in most cases when an uninsured child gets really sick, that they end up going to the emergency room and they get some type of care. But that is not the way the health system should operate. They need preventative care. They need vaccinations. They need to go to the doctor for routine checkups. We do not want a situation where the only time children get any kind of medical treatment is if they really get ill and they have to go to the emergency room.

It is my hope that the Republicans will recognize that while we seek to enable children to receive treatment, the matter itself is not routine. This is an urgent matter. Any kind of obstructionism on the issue of kids' health insurance I believe is really callous, and the Democrats, of course, continue to articulate and move forward with various plans that both the President and other of my Democratic colleagues have put forward.

I just wanted to talk a little about some of the things that Massachusetts does to give an idea of how this would actually work.

Again in Massachusetts, very similar to what happened here at the Federal level, there was an effort a few years ago to try to come up with a universal health care system where the State would basically provide health care or health insurance, I should say, for everyone. But in the same way that we were not able to accomplish that on a Federal level, the effort instead began to focus sort of in a piecemeal fashion on what elements of the uninsured could be insured effectively and at a reasonably affordable price.

One of the points that we keep making, those of us who would like to see kids' health insurance enacted, is that it is very affordable. It does not cost a lot of money to provide health insurance for kids. And we are talking about 10 million children right now that do not have health insurance. If you look at it in the spectrum of things, it is relatively cheap to provide insurance for them.

Basically, Massachusetts recognized this. They figured that if they could not move for health insurance for everyone, at least they could move for health insurance for children. Just to give some idea of how they did it, they expanded both their Medicaid program and the Children's Medical Security Plan, which was a State plan they had in effect beginning in 1993. Medicaid paid for a significant part with Federal dollars but now covers everyone up to 133 percent of the poverty level or all families of four with incomes up to \$20,748 a year.

So what they did is they expanded Medicaid so that it covered a little higher income level, 133 percent of the poverty level, for families of four with incomes up to \$20,748 a year. But then

they have this supplemental plan, the Children's Medical Security Plan, which provides a somewhat less generous package, if you will, than Medicaid, more limited mental health and prescription drugs; but for families with incomes of less than \$31,200 a year, 200 percent of poverty, the coverage is free, and they have a copayment of \$1 per doctor's visit.

So now we are getting up to people, families at the 200 percent of poverty level. For families with incomes of \$31,200 to \$62,400, the charge is \$10.50 per child per month, and the copayment is \$3. And above that level, the charges are \$52.50 a month and \$5 a visit.

So essentially what they are doing here is, on a sliding scale, making it possible for people at these higher income levels, they are not terribly high income levels, but at higher income levels would still be able to opt into this program. It is a way to guarantee that every child who does not have health insurance now would be able to take advantage of this program.

Ultimately, no child would be ineligible for this type of program unless the parents, on their own, voluntarily decided that they did not want to participate in it. Everyone would be eligible on a sliding scale up to any income level.

The program is administered for the State by the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company at a charge of \$10.50 a month for each child, and it allows parents to take their children to any doctor in the State. So again you have complete choice in terms of where you go to the doctor or the hospital.

Again the reason why this is so successful is essentially because of what it means for preventative care. In the article in the New York Times there is a Dr. Robert Sorrenti, a pediatrician who is a vice president of John Hancock, and he said that the sort of routine treatment, regular doctor visits, vaccinations, the preventative type care, was often avoided by parents who were short of money, but 90 percent of the registered children in this program are now seeing a doctor on a regular basis for preventative purposes.

In Massachusetts, approximately 150,000 uninsured children, about 60,000, will be covered through the expanded Medicaid program that Massachusetts now offers, and they expect that the expanded Children's Medical Security Plan program would reach 40,000 to 60,000 more children. It has enrolled about 7,000 more children since the expansion took effect in November.

So if you are taking that full range of 150,000 uninsured children, between the 60,000 covered by Medicaid and possibly another 60,000 that would be covered under this supplemental insurance program, you can see how you are getting very close, really, to almost 100 percent of the uninsured children that would be covered by the plan.

Of course, the real key is what we are going to do on the Federal level. Obviously, it is very good for States like New York and Massachusetts and others to experiment and to come up with different ways of trying to provide health insurance for children, but the problem will not be addressed on a universal basis on the Federal level unless this Congress takes up the issue.

I myself and many of my colleagues are determined that we will continue to raise the issue, we will continue to point out the problem of the uninsured and how many children there are out there until the Republican leadership and our colleagues on the other side decide to finally bring this up, give it a hearing, bring the legislation to the floor, and move toward making sure that every child in this Nation has the opportunity to have health insurance. In the long run if we do not do this, the negative impact not only on our children but on our Nation as a whole, I think, could be catastrophic because the numbers of the uninsured continue to increase on a regular basis.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND THE BUDGET PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McINNIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to talk about a little bit is the budget and the budget process, the situation that we are in, because recently the Senate Democrats voted down the balanced budget amendment. All the balanced budget amendment really said is that the Congress of the United States and the President would each year pass a budget that was balanced. No mystery to it, Mr. Speaker. All it meant was whatever we bring in, that is what we spend. I would love to see us spend less than what we bring in. I would certainly settle right now to say just, "You don't spend more than you bring in." But I guess the President and the Senate thought that was too controversial of a concept for us to pass a balanced budget so they voted it down and great for them.

What is the situation that we are in right now? Well, for the children of America, I have got four kids and I know the Speaker has a large family, also. We are concerned about our children and their future. What will this leave for the kids? Today our national debt is \$5.1 trillion. We have not had a balanced budget since 1969. If we look at that in terms of what it will mean to kids, kids who are graduating from school and going to work today will have a higher tax burden than any other graduating class in the history of the United States of America. They will have higher interest rates as a result of a budget that is not balanced,

and they will have less job opportunities.

Now, if we would balance the budget and pass a balanced budget, they are two different things. Passing the balanced budget amendment would ensure to the children in the future that we would not get in this huge deficit situation year after year again, and it would also say that we would have no more deficits and we would start paying down the national debt.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, the interest on the national debt, I think, is at \$231 billion each year. That is around \$20 billion a month, give or take, because the interest rates change. I do not know what the annual budget is for the State of Colorado but I know that Colorado is a little bit smaller than the State of Georgia. The State of Georgia has a budget of about \$11 billion a year. So for Georgia, we have a budget of \$11 billion a year and we are paying \$20 billion each month in interest on the national debt.

We have obviously got to get this under control. Our children, Mr. Speaker, are paying higher interest rates and higher taxes as a result of this massive debt.

I have with me the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] who has been a leader on the Committee on Ways and Means trying to put some sanity in our tax policies and we want to talk about the IRS and taxes in a minute, but right now let me yield to the gentleman on the balanced budget and the need for it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding.

I have listened with great interest to so many points of view, but one thing, Mr. Speaker, that comes through loudly and clearly from the American people is the notion that we must move to put our fiscal house in order. Regrettably administrations of both parties, and indeed this institution in previous years have failed to live up to the responsibility that every American family must follow, and, that is, to live within our means. It is an exercise every family practices sitting around the kitchen table. When families are outspending their rate of income, they have to make changes.

What we talk about here is not shrouded by mysteries of micro or macro economics. There are no hidden agendas or anything that should stunt or scare us as a people. No, simply what we must do is live within our means. As my colleague from Georgia pointed out, many of the respective State constitutions in this union of 50 sovereign States mandate that those States operate within the parameters of a balanced budget. Indeed, it is unconstitutional according to those State constitutions for those States to do otherwise.

What we are saying is that that measure of fiscal sanity, simply living

within our means, be done here at the Federal level. It has been 28 years since Congress, working with the President, has balanced the budget.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let us talk about 1969 for a minute. In 1969, Jimi Hendrix was probably coming out with "Are You Experienced?" That was his album. The Beatles, I think, were coming out with the White Album. They had just probably found Paul. There was the "Is Paul Dead/I Am the Walrus" debate with the Beatles. The Beatles had not broken up yet. Elvis was making his comeback. Elvis was still alive and doing fine in Graceland and all over America. Neil Armstrong was about to walk on the Moon in July 1969. Richard Nixon was in the White House and serving his first term in the White House. Nineteen sixty-nine. That is when we are talking about we had the last balanced budget.

This is absurd. This is the United States of America. This is not the value system that you and I were raised with that says Congress could go on spending money, more than it brings in year after year and do what I call the kids' tax.

Now, the way the kids' tax works is a real popular tax in Washington. That is when we in Congress spend more money than we are bringing in on new programs to get us reelected and we send the bill to the kids. It is the equivalent of going out to eat and having a big time on the town and on the way out the door the man says, "Your bill comes to \$78."

You say, "Don't worry about it. Send it to my 4-year-old 20 years from now. He'll pick up the tab." It is the kids' tax and that is what we have gotten comfortable with since 1969 passing on the debt to the children of America.

□ 1515

Mr. HAYWORTH. In addition, as my colleague from Georgia points out, Mr. Speaker, in the process what we have done is something that is remarkably reckless and fundamentally unhelpful and unhealthful to generations yet to come, to generations who have yet to exercise their franchise as voters, to young people who have no voice at the ballot box, and it is this:

What I hold here in my hand, Mr. Speaker, is the voting card given to me as a Member of Congress, and, Mr. Speaker, some folks around this institution, in an effort I suppose to laugh to keep from crying, have taken to calling this card the world's most expensive credit card, and there is a reason for that nickname for this card. It is because when I received this copy, it came with a debt of \$5 trillion, and to put that on our children is one of the greatest tragedies and one of the greatest derelictions of duty that this, the world's greatest deliberative body, could fail to act on.

And of course we are indebted to our President, to his own budgeteers who a

couple of years ago in laying out the administration's budget offered a page in their preamble to those numbers called generational accounting, where the President asked his budgeteers to try to calculate for the next generation of taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, for kids like John Michael Hayworth who is now 3 years old, 25 years from now when he enters the working world, by that time at age 28 moving toward what we hope is a steadily increasing paycheck, heading toward his prime as a working adult. The President's own budgeteers, forecasting what those average taxpayers would have to surrender a quarter of a century hence, found these disturbing numbers. The President's own budgeteers tell us that if we do nothing to change the rate of spending in Washington, DC, if we fail to balance it—

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If we fail to balance the budget, that generation of taxpayers would have to surrender in excess of 80 percent of their incomes.

I would gladly yield.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to make sure that you understand. You are talking about your child and my child, and any parent out here in America hearing this should pay attention. Children will be having to pay an 80 to 83-percent tax rate just to sustain the current level of goods and services.

Now here is a summary of the Clinton budget. I hope that we can get this on camera for the folks back home, but one thing that is interesting is after the administration torpedoed the balanced budget amendment in the Senate, then they said we do not need the amendment to balance the budget. They introduced a bill that they call the balanced budget, and in a year, if the gentleman can read this, I am not sure that he can, but in the year 2002 we would have a deficit of \$69 billion. So there is nothing balanced about the Clinton budget.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And the other disturbing fact about this, and first of all let us thank the President for putting a budget on the table as a starting point, but there is a long way to go, the other disturbing fact about this, Mr. Speaker, is that 98 percent of the cost savings, 98 percent of the hard work would have to come in the final 2 years of that cycle.

Now, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I can put this into everyday language in terms of going on a diet. I think it is safe to say that people can take a look at me and, as the attorneys would say, there is a preponderance of physical evidence to indicate that I need to change my eating habits, I have to slim down; I would be the first to admit that. But you do not slim down by losing maybe a gram a week, or saying you are going to lose 50 pounds and saying you are going to lose a gram a week for 4 years time, and then in the

final 2 weeks of the diet lose 48 pounds or 49 pounds to get to that level of loss.

It does not work that way, and I insist even as we try to tighten our belts, so to speak, and act in a fiscally responsible way to help future generations to help this Nation, we have to get on a process that is very simple: Where we do not spend any more this year than we did the preceding year, where we move with fiscal sanity and responsibility to address these problems.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman from Arizona will yield again, getting back to this chart a minute, as you say, here is where it is: 98 percent of the deficit reduction allegedly comes in the last 2 years. Well, that would be well beyond the current administration's service in the White House.

So there is absolute hypocrisy in such a budget to call it a balanced budget.

The other thing is that it actually increases the budget next year by an additional \$24 billion in terms of deficit spending—another \$24 billion in debt. So you have raised some good points.

We have been joined by the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] who has been a very active Member of the Education Committee, moved over to the Committee on Appropriations this year so he can get a little better angle at tightening the belt some, and, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, we would certainly like to yield to you and are delighted to have you with us.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman and my colleague from Arizona as well.

I saw the special orders, and I think it is important to bring up just a couple of other points.

I listened to a Republican Governor the other day, and what does this mean to the future, not only to our senior citizens, but to our children as well, as far as a balanced budget? He said that his father took home 82 percent of his paycheck, his brother and his sister only take home 45 percent of their paycheck, and that under the current spending of Congress, an increase in taxes, he can expect his children to take between 16 and 18 percent of their paycheck home.

That is a pretty sad commentary, that if we do not turn this around, what is the impact it is going to have on every American in this country to the negative?

When we talk about a billion dollars a day going just to pay for the interest on the national debt, and not one cent of that goes to pay for Medicare, not one cent goes to education, not one cent of it goes for law enforcement or the rest; what could we not do with \$365 billion in a year for the American people in the same areas that many of us—that I believe the liberals want better education, I believe they want better national security. But they want to

do it from a government level which has spent money.

I would also like to cover the history, when you talk about 28 years, some of the initiatives, Mr. Speaker, that they have gone through to try and balance the budget. Remember there was a commission put together to balance the budget prior to the Grace Commission that said we are going to balance the budget; they were not able to do it. Then Congress came forth, and this is when the Democrats were in the majority. They said, "We are going to give you Gramm-Rudman," and the deal was that for every tax dollar you take in, we are going to cut spending by three, and we are going to balance the budget. Of course it did not work.

Then when George Bush famously moved his lips and increased taxes, the Democrats were still in power, and the deal that they proposed to the President, President Bush, was again, "For every tax dollar that we increase, we are going to cut spending by three to balance the budget."

Mr. Speaker, there were only 13 Republicans that voted for that bill to increase taxes that year before I got here, and if you look when George Bush, what they also told him, they were going to put, of the 13 appropriations committees, they were going to put fire walls between each one of those committees so you could not take from one committee and take to another, and to even secure it more, they were going to put a cap on that so there is no way that you could increase spending.

Well, what we found, and I was here in this body at the time, is that the way that the majority of the Democratic majority got around it is they put everything on emergency spending, which was exempt. They also had continuing resolutions which meant they carried over the spending to the next year and then the next year and the next year so that they could get around the caps and that spending keeps increasing.

It is very, very important to note that the President says he wanted a balanced budget when he ran for Congress within 5 years, but at the same time the President in the 104th Congress, to tell you the smoke and mirrors, the President gave us three balanced budgets that increased the deficit by over \$150 billion, and when it finally—the pressure came on the President to give us a balanced budget scored by CBO, that 70 percent of the cuts came in the last year. This budget that the President is recommending that we look at makes 98 percent of all the cuts in the sixth and seventh year when he would not even be here.

So when we look at about an honest balanced budget with numbers, there is no realistic chance of that particular budget ever balancing, and I would like to make one last point on it.

The President said that he is going to increase modernization of our national security assets that we keep pushing out into the outyears, and guess what? That takes place in the years 6 and 7 of his balanced budget.

Now do you think that Members on the other side of the aisle are going to decrease with 98 percent of the cuts in social spending and increase defense spending at that time? It is not a legitimate budget, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, let me yield to the gentleman from Arizona and—but can I jump in for 1 second? I have got some things just for the fun of it here.

On a trillion dollars, just our budget right now, is \$1.6 trillion, thereabouts. Now the Office of Management and Budget director had calculated a couple of years ago. Since the gentleman here is an old top gun, I want a young top gun, but it has been awhile.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Long in the tooth.

Mr. KINGSTON. That if Mr. CUNNINGHAM's jet was flying overhead at the speed of sound and spewing out a roll of dollar bills behind it, the plane would have to fly for more than 15 years before it wheeled out \$1.6 trillion, and I do not think you have that much fuel in any plane.

And here is another way to look at it, and this is from the Wall Street Journal 2 years ago. Newspaper tabloids say that O.J. Simpson paid about \$55,000 a day in legal bills, \$55,000, and actually this is for the criminal trial and not for the civil trial. The trial would last 26 million days or about 100,000 years before O.J. had spent \$1.6 trillion.

Let me yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Georgia for illuminating the sheer volume of \$1 trillion—\$1.6 trillion because the danger, Mr. Speaker, is that we become numb, or we are numbed, to these totals and these figures as they are bandied about, but we are talking real money, and we are talking real people, and we are talking about a real debt that will hang over the heads of our children, a debt that as we have seen with yearly deficits actually adds to our spending a debt tax, if you will, in terms of higher interest rates.

I often have occasion to visit high schools across the width and breadth of the Sixth District of Arizona, and I was at the new Fountain Hills High School last Friday morning for a townhall meeting listening to the perspective of these young people, some of whom have already gained their franchise to vote having celebrated their 18th birthdays, others looking forward eagerly to the opportunity to engage in the national debate and have a voice at the ballot box, and we talked about what this deficit tax, if you will, actually means with the higher interest rates when

they want to get a student loan, when they want to have a car loan. The fact is that they are paying more and more money on that loan because of higher interest rates, and that is money that is likewise taken out of their pocket in addition to the taxes they encounter and the taxes their parents encounter and the taxes that now on average working families in America actually account for more of the family budget than food, shelter, and clothing combined.

□ 1530

Mr. KINGSTON. That is absolutely ridiculous. As a result, the American middle class families now pay an average of 24 percent just in Federal income taxes, compared to their counterparts 20 years ago, who paid about 16 percent, and 30 years ago they paid about 5 percent. The average tax burden right now is 38 percent on average middle class families.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to my colleagues about the IRS and about tax simplification and so forth, but before I do that, let me give my colleagues two more perspectives on \$1 trillion. Shaq O'Neill makes about \$30 million a year, \$30 million a season, if you will. He would have to play 33,000 seasons to make \$1 trillion. The man makes \$30 million a year. He would have to play 33,000 seasons to make \$1 trillion. That is ridiculous.

Another definition. Our national budget each year is about \$1.6 trillion. If you stuck \$1 bills inside 50-foot boxcars on a train, that is about \$65 million per boxcar. How long would the train be? Would you care to guess?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would not conjecture.

Mr. KINGSTON. It would be 240 miles long. Think about that.

Let me yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Let me give my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, some food for thought on how we can balance the budget and not cut some of the valuable programs that we are looking for.

Let us take, for example, education. I was the subcommittee chairman, basically K through 12 during the 104th Congress. In some areas, in some school districts, we get as little as 23 cents on a dollar out of Federal education programs.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] the other night in a special order was pointing out that there are 760 Federal education programs, all with bureaucracies, all taking money away from getting the dollars down to the classroom. The average is around 50 cents on a dollar for most areas, but in some areas it is as little as 23 cents on a dollar. That is cutting education because the dollars are not going the way the American taxpayers sent it to Washington to improve education, but it is going to support a bureaucracy and large numbers of programs.

The President in his budget wants a new \$3 billion literacy program. There are 30 current literacy programs in those 760 programs, and only 14 are funded. Title I, for example, is our war against illiteracy. But yet the President wants to come up with a new \$3 billion program with new bureaucracies in the Department of Education, and why do we not eliminate the programs that are not working of the 30, focus on the ones that are, and drive the money down to the local areas? That is one way.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, but what is interesting is when I talk to employers in my area and I say, what do we need to do in our education system to prepare our kids to go out and compete in the world market against Japanese, British, German children and so forth, they say, you need to have reading and math backgrounds, very strong. Federal education, of all of those 700 education programs, we have 14 reading programs, we have 39 art education programs, we have 11 mathematics programs and 27 environmental programs.

Now, I think environmental and art education are very important, but if you want a job you better go in with math and reading. If we want our children to be able to compete on a global market, we have to do that. That is what you are saying, it would not cost a dime just to redirect funds, but it would produce people who are going to be better assets to the job market.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the same time, taxpayers do not have to pay for the extra bureaucracy that is not actually going down to education, so it lessens the burden of taxes and at the same time reduces the size of government that we do away with wasted bureaucracies. It is common sense.

Let me give you another example. How can we balance the budget and actually enhance money to education? The President's direct lending program for student loans was capped at 10 percent during the 104th Congress. When the Government shut down, the President, one of his goals was to take that to 100 percent. We balked and went to 40 percent. At 10 percent it cost \$1 billion, not \$1 million, but \$1 billion more in administrative fees. This is a GAO figure. Fact, not Republicanism. It takes \$4 billion more to collect those dollars, and that was only capped at 10 percent.

So when it went to 40 percent, when the Government shut down at the request of the President, we limited the administrative fees which basically go to pay for a higher bureaucracy. And what we did in the subcommittee is we drove an increased Pell grants for poor children to the highest level ever. We thought that was more important to get the money down to the kids instead of paying for a bureaucracy.

We increased the level for special education children to the highest level ever, more important than paying a bureaucracy. We increased student loans, Mr. Speaker, by 50 percent, not 15 but 50 percent, and they said we killed education or cut it by \$10 billion. We drove the money down to the zip code, eliminated a bureaucracy, and what Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. McKEON from California are trying to do is look at the programs and let us focus on the ones that work.

The last point, if the gentleman would be kind enough to yield, AmeriCorps, \$27,000 per volunteer. The President talks about a volunteer force. In Baltimore it costs \$50,000 for a volunteer. And our tax dollars are going to pay for that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, would you explain what AmeriCorps is, because I think there may be some folks who want to know what AmeriCorps is.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. AmeriCorps is one of the President's pet programs that allows people to go out and help in other areas; for example, painting a fence or cleaning a yard for a senior citizen or doing different kinds of work, and that is supposed to be voluntary, but they also receive an average of \$27,000 for that activity, which we think is wrong. Part of that is used as direct pay, part of it is used for child care, part of it is used for administration costs. But we can spend our dollars better at that.

The other area in which we waste money, if we are getting so little return out of Federal Government dollars that taxpayers pay, and a State bureaucracy is just as bad as a Federal bureaucracy if it takes the money from getting down to the teachers and the students and the parents where they can direct it, but if we cannot pass school bond issues at the local level because people are only getting 45 percent of their paycheck because of high taxes and big government, how are we going to build up the infrastructure?

Well, one of the ways in which we are proposing is to take private enterprise, let the IBM's, let the Baby Bells, let the AT&T's, Alcoa put in the fiber optics, let Apple put in the computer system so that they are not archaic within a year, and give them a tax break for investing in our taxes.

We have less, Mr. Speaker, than 12 percent of our classrooms in this Nation that have even a single phone jack. Business tells us that a large portion of the children coming out of high school do not even qualify for an entry level position because they cannot read. The President was right. We need 4-year-olds to read and 8-year-olds to do math, but if they cannot read and write, they cannot speak the English language or they do not have the technical skills, that delta that my colleagues talk about between the rich and the poor all the time is going to

grow exponentially. So it is one of the ways that we can actually enhance and save our tax dollars.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to thank my colleague from California, because not only has he outlined the parameters of the problem, but he has offered a solution.

Mr. Speaker, just simply to bring this home to Arizona, the Sixth Congressional District and indeed throughout the State of Arizona, there are real problems with inequities in school funding. There are real challenges for rural school districts who, through the evisceration of resource-based industries, have seen their tax bases decline exponentially.

Indeed, I think of Superior High School in the town of Superior, AZ, in the Sixth Congressional District, where the high school is anything but superior in terms of the building. Now, the students that go there are truly superior, fine young people working hard, but they are in a situation where their school has fallen into disrepair and the tax base has been eradicated.

So we have to look for other ways to end these funding inequities, and that is why I am so pleased that my colleague from California wants to step forward with a plan that would call on private enterprise to step forward, and now with a seat on Ways and Means I look forward to working with the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the chairman of that committee, to find a way to deal with the Tax Code to help business help schools.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, I was talking to a private school, they had a private school in my district last week and he was telling me about a private school not in my district, but elsewhere in the country, where they were getting away from this rat race that a lot of our school systems are in in terms of buying new computers, because every year you buy new computers and because of the bureaucracy it takes a long time. So if you and I go out and buy a computer tomorrow, it is going to be obsolete. But in the school system it is even more because of all of the redtape that they have to go through.

So what they say is the school system does not buy computers any more. Each child has a laptop and in their lockers are batteries where they charge their laptops for 4 hours and then they can use them during the course of the day. I strongly believe that that is the technology that we are moving toward rather than having every gizmo that comes out of IBM, and so forth.

But the beauty of it is that these laptops are sponsored by businesses who want to get the kids to be computer friendly, so they underwrite it, and it does not cost the school system, or it costs them a lot less. That is the

technology. We are so often playing by yesterday's rules when it comes to government. Technology is lightyears in front of us.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, there is one central point that should be our guide. Every dime appropriated at the Federal level should go to help teachers teach and help children learn. That is our challenge, that is our mission, and that is one of the things I will work on in this 105th Congress.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from California, let me say that we have to have child-centered education. Right now the Washington, DC school district spends, I think it is about \$10,000 per child because I know that Utah is the lowest in the country at about \$3,400 and Washington, DC is the highest in the country. We spend \$10,000 per child in Washington DC, and yet this Congress is going to have to spend an emergency appropriation to fund new boilers in Washington DC because they are about to blow up. That is how wasteful, I would say, and overburdened some bureaucracy can be. The money should be going to the teacher and the classroom.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if you look at the American people, there are bright sun spots in education. You go to a lot of the schools, we have fantastic teachers and we have some fantastic programs. But if you go, for example, outside Chicago, where I used to coach and teach, about 5 miles down the road there is about 7 miles of Federal housing projects. Those kids do not learn in school. They carry guns, not books. Most of the girls become pregnant one or two times. The grandmothers raise them, and if you are a male child the only hope you have is to be in a gang, or a female child, even today are becoming more and more involved. The chance for them of achieving the American dream is less; the welfare reform helped that.

But those are some of the other ways in education that I think that we can enhance it, and there are so many ways, Mr. Speaker. We are only covering just a little bit here.

Remember a gentleman, Mr. Speaker, named Jaime Escalante? He had a vision that he could teach minority children in the inner cities physics. How much support did he have with the kids? They thought he was nuts. The administrators and the teachers thought you cannot do that in an inner-city school. We have tried it. You are going to fail. What about the parents? He had zero support. Well, Jaime Escalante set out to teach these children physics. It was up to I think 90 percent of them got A's and went on to college in physics when he proved it.

Then you got the support of the children, you got the support of the parents, you got the support of the administrators and the community to invest in education.

People today look at all of these programs at the low return that they are getting on the education dollar for their children, and they are not as apt to cough up money.

The second aspect of that is that people are tax tired. They are taking home less. My children are only going to take home 16 to 18 percent of their paycheck. How much are they going to be willing to invest into education?

□ 1545

All the rest of the money is going to be paying for interest on the debt. So the ballpark line is let us have a system that people can believe in and want to get out and support. Let us give them the resources at home, not the Government, that can support that vision. We can enhance education instead of letting the Federal Government, like the liberals and many of the socialists want to do, to have the Government control everything at great waste.

The direct lending program I mentioned a minute ago, of the President, \$50 million in 1 year wasted in a study, in a program on how they could get out the money better—\$50 million in 1 year. Yet they want all of that to go out of the Department of Education. What a waste that would be.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I do not know why we as government bureaucracies just do not think. There was a case of a school district that spent, listen to this, over \$1,000 to obtain a government grant that had a \$13 value. They used it to park their bus one day. They spent \$1,000 to get a \$13 grant. Does that make sense?

There was another case, and the gentleman knows this, his committee ferreted it out, of about \$81,000 in safe and drug-free school money that was spent buying dentures for toothbrushing lessons, which is important. Of course, I think it is a parent job, not an educator job. But that money should have gone into drug education.

There was another one, and the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] remembers his committee found out, out of a school system, and I think I am 90 percent sure of the State, but because of the 10 percent uncertainty I will not say it, but they spent the safe-and-drug-free school money, \$171,000 on a 3-day retreat. That is absurd. That is a waste of money. None of that money got to the teacher and to the child in the classroom.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think the point is well made. Again the message we want to share, Mr. Speaker, with those who join us via television is the notion that we can do a better job, use our resources in a more intelligent fashion

when we focus on having children learn in a safe environment, when we assure equality of opportunity for every schoolchild from the inner city to the most rural regions of this country, to places in between, where they have an opportunity to have a quality educational experience, and where we focus resources on helping teachers teach, helping children learn, and empowering parents to make sure their children have an education worthy of their goals and worthy of this Nation's future.

That is the challenge before us. That is why I look forward to working with the gentleman from California. That is why I look forward to working with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] who is preparing legislation that would say that we should direct 90 percent of the money raised at the Federal level for education, we should work to ensure that 90 percent of that money gets back into the classrooms locally to help teachers teach and help students learn, and quit empire-building with the Washington bureaucracies; because this redistribution of wealth, as my colleague the gentleman from California has pointed out, and I have seen statistics that are even more dire, where according to some studies only 8 cents of every dollar ends up in some classroom settings.

The answer is more than dollars and cents, C-E-N-T-S; it is common sense, S-E-N-S-E, that we must work to preserve, to empower students, teachers, and parents in this educational endeavor.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California, who wants to make a few more remarks, and then I want to pick the brain of the gentleman from the Committee on Ways and Means and talk about the IRS. If the gentleman from California, the other gentleman, wants to join us, he is welcome to.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, what would we ask our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to agree with us on when we look at the President's budget and the Republican budget to come together?

I think there are some key issues. First of all, we would want the numbers to balance at the agreed amount of time, which is 7 years.

Second, we do not want to increase taxes to do that. The American public and the economy is stagnant at about 3 and 4 percent. Remember that the President in his 1993 budget increased taxes \$270 billion. He promised a middle-class tax cut and increased middle-class taxes. He increased the gas tax. He increased the tax on Social Security earners, and increased or at least had even a retroactive tax. The President in this budget increases taxes, Mr. Speaker. We disagree with that.

We would also like Members on the other side of the aisle to agree with us that it is a realistic budget. When the President in the 104th Congress gave us three separate balanced budgets that did not increase the balanced budget in time, but yet when his fourth one scored by CBO came up, 70 percent of the cuts took place in year 7. It is not realistic.

This budget that the President has given us, 98 percent of the cuts take place in years 6 and 7, when he would not even be here. That is not realistic. We are asking for a realistic budget without tax increases on the American public, legitimate savings to save the programs. I think if we take a look also, that there should not be any gimmicks, that the numbers are real.

For example, on Medicare part A to part B, people usually do not understand when we go through it, but let me give an example. If you take Medicare Part A, mostly the in-home care, and transfer those dollars to the general fund, that is like taking your MasterCard or Visa card and paying—saying, hey, I want to borrow the money to pay for it later. That is just increasing the deficit for our children later down the road. What we want to do is fund it so when you write a check, the money is already there. There is no gimmick to that.

But by using part A to the general fund, it is smoke and mirrors to say we are going to use those savings to balance the budget when you are actually increasing spending.

So I think there are several of those kinds of areas that when we balance the budget we will be asking the President and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to at least have the common sense to agree on a real balanced budget, using real numbers with real savings and no gimmicks and no tax increases.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. He is welcome to stay and talk about this next issue. I will introduce it this way.

First of all, let me say, we want to talk about the IRS. The criticism is not to the employees, the criticism is to the system. Right now, that system has a Tax Code that is two volumes total and 1,378 pages. It is an IRS that has 480 tax forms, and 280 forms that tell you how to fill out the 480.

In 1994, the Tax Foundation estimates that businesses spent, listen to these numbers, 3.6 billion hours and individuals spent \$1.8 billion preparing their tax returns. It is too complicated. One final statistic and then I will yield to the gentleman, because it is all up to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means to get this straight.

According to a study of Daniel Pilla of the Cato Institute, the IRS gives out wrong answers to more than 8 million taxpayers a year. It is too complicated. What can we do to simplify the tax system?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, because he asks a question that far exceeds the \$64,000 question. Indeed, it is a question that deals with trillions of dollars and is fraught with many challenges to our Nation.

I think it is important, in the spirit of simplifying, to first define our goal. I believe, quite candidly, Mr. Speaker, that the American people will accept nothing less than our pledge to end the IRS as we know it.

One way that I think my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, would certainly champion is to put the service back into the final word in the name Internal Revenue Service; to the extent possible, to end the adversarial relationships that have grown up between the IRS and the citizenry.

Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that we have the highest voluntary compliance rate of any Nation in the world when it comes to accruing revenue. But let us also understand this: that since this Nation ratified the 16th amendment, and the first direct tax on income came about in 1913, the cost of government, the cost of the Federal Government, even taking into account inflation, has increased in excess of 113,000 percent. So there are many questions we have to deal with.

I thank my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] for holding hearings about tax simplification, for working to get to the bottom of many of these issues that confront us: for example, the notion that the new computer system at the Internal Revenue Service, with an expenditure in excess of \$4 billion, is not working; and still, Mr. Speaker, the confounding notion that within our Tax Code we penalize people for succeeding, we penalize people for getting married, and finally, we penalize people for dying.

For although some refer to it as an estate tax, the fact is that we have, in essence, a death tax, where people who work hard, like the seniors who live in the Sixth District of Arizona in and around the Sun Lakes Retirement Community in my district, have worked hard, have achieved, would like to pass on, quite frankly, their prosperity to their children, pass on their businesses, and such is the excessive tax rate that these people are hurt.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, these are senior citizens who lived through the Depression. They are frugal. The gentleman is talking about my dad. He was raised in Brooklyn, NY. He fought and he saved, and because of the results of foregoing some pleasures and sacrificing a lot, he has savings now. Because of our tax system, he cannot pass that on. He is not a wealthy man, but he is a middle-class guy who saved. Because of that, he is now being penalized.

That is the same person the gentleman is talking about: the seniors in Arizona, they are in Georgia, they are all over the United States of America.

Mr. HAYWORTH. That is what we want to work to change. We need to change drastically and, yes, even work to repeal this death tax. We need to work to change the system of taxation where people are penalized for succeeding in our economy. We need to hold hearings, as we will, to take a look at alternative notions to the income tax.

Our majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] champions the flat tax. Our chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] champions the notion of a consumption tax, most often reflected in a national retail sales tax.

What is very important for us, both in the Committee on Ways and Means and as a Congress, and indeed as a country, is to examine very carefully all the implications, the benefits, the challenges of these different alternatives and then move forward, once we achieve a consensus, to have that type of tax reform that will indeed end the IRS as we know it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me give the gentleman a statistic that was sent to me by my friend, a Dr. Whitaker of Warner Robins, GA. In 1913 when the original income tax went into effect, if you had an income of \$20,000, your tax rate was 1 percent. If you average out a \$20,000 income in 1913 to today's dollars, that would be the equivalent of making \$298,000 a year.

So for us today to have the same rates as we originally had on the income tax in 1913, someone making \$298,000 a year would have a tax rate today of 1 percent. So the tax rate has just gone up and up and up and up, since we know that not to be the case. Even somebody making \$20,000 a year would jump on paying the 1-percent tax.

Incidentally, the highest tax in 1913, the highest percentage was 7 percent. And now the average for middle-class Americans is about 24 percent, easily 30 percent for many people, and 33 percent and on up.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, the other thing we need to do, as I talked about, in terms of penalizing people for succeeding, is the excessive taxation, and I really call it the success and prosperity tax. We have come to call it the capital gains tax, and we welcome the initiative the President has put forth in terms of wanting very tightly targeted tax relief in terms of capital gains taxes.

□ 1600

His plan limits it only to homeowners. There are many small business owners across the country who have

worked hard, who have succeeded, who will have more money to save, spend, and invest in job creation and in the economy if they have more of their money to hang onto.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the American people, let us just say, had \$50 more in their pocket because the Federal Government did not take that money, we confiscate it now, but if we left \$50 more in the pockets of, say, 200 million Americans, that would be another \$10 billion in the economy. Will that \$50 dollars in your pocket send to college? No. But you will go out to eat more often; you might buy another pair of shoes, another pair of socks, a belt. And when you do that, small businesses will expand to react to that \$10 billion infusion of money into the economy. When those small businesses expand, jobs are created. When more jobs are created, more people go to work. When more people go to work, less people are on welfare and other public assistance programs and more tax revenues come in.

President Reagan and President Kennedy both proved this through tax cuts in the 1960's and the 1980's. If we today just give our average amount of tax relief, we would be creating more jobs and increasing revenues. I strongly feel that is very consistent with deficit reduction.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a very important first step that we take these important steps, even as we look at broad based tax reform, that we offer tax relief and tax cuts. This is another area where there are some honest disagreements.

Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin came to testify in front of the Committee on Ways and Means a couple of weeks ago. The administration has a limited plan for a \$500 per child tax credit. I asked Secretary Rubin about that single mom in the sixth district of Arizona, and there are many of them, who may not be receiving child support payments from their former spouse, who may be working very hard to stay above the poverty level and therefore not qualifying for the earned income tax credit and let us say the single mom has two children, ages 13 and 15.

Under the administration's plan, that family would receive no tax credit for those children because, you see, the President's plan only goes to age 12. Those of us who are parents, and the gentleman from Georgia and I, the gentleman from Georgia's daughter is just entering her teenage years, our eldest daughter is just leaving her teenage years. There is one basic principle: Children grow more expensive as they grow up.

Mr. KINGSTON. Please do not tell me.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think it is important that that single mom and single moms like her across the country have the chance to experience that same type of tax relief.

The secretary in response, it is not my intent to put words in his mouth, to paraphrase his comment in response was, well, we had to make tough choices and tightly target these tax cuts. And therein lies a philosophical difference. Good people can disagree.

We believe you can expand that opportunity. You can help those single moms. You can help those families who are having a difficult time and at the same time, with the infusion of capital into our economy, you can actually increase jobs, increase prosperity and move toward fiscal responsibility.

The two goals are not mutually exclusive. It is possible to move to be more fiscally responsible and to allow working Americans to hold on to more of their hard-earned money and send less of it here to Washington. That is the challenge that still confronts us.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining with me. We have just a few minutes to close.

I want to say this: In Washington we have an administration that loves big government and talks about the big government being over with. Yet in the State of the Union Address, I think there were introduced 123 new spending programs.

The American people are real good. They are far better than any law that the U.S. Congress can pass. People are better than laws. What we need to do in America is empower people, not lawyers and not police states and so forth, but people.

Give you an example, last year 90 million Americans volunteered over 4 hours a week for charity. That is about 19 billion man-hours a year voluntary. If you round that out at \$10 an hour, that is \$190 billion volunteered last year by Americans. Add that to the monetary contributions, which is about \$150 billion a year, you have an American public that can give and give and give. It is far superior to the form of government that we have in so many cases to deliver goods and services to people back home. Our colleagues in Washington need to recognize that. Get off the people's back. Let them do their own thing.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Georgia. Again, he points out so many facts that are pertinent in this debate and in this endeavor. A couple of thoughts come to mind in the wake of the President's State of the Union Message.

I talked to one of my most important constituents, indeed, my most important constituent, my wife Mary. Ms. Mary's first question was this: "How do we pay for all these programs?" Will this lead to a greater deficit?

And that is a question that is one that is filled with compassion and with common sense. Let us work to rein in spending, to allow working families to hold on to more of their hard-earned

money, to look for what is reasonable and rational. That is the key in this Congress and in the years ahead.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for joining me.

THE TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION REFORM ACT OF 1997, H.R. 930

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Travel and Transportation Reform Act of 1997, H.R. 930. Joining me as original cosponsors are the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

The Federal Government's travel expenditures are massive. In fiscal year 1994, the last year for which we have precise figures, the Government spent more than \$7.6 billion on travel including transportation, lodging, rental cars and other related expenses. There are ample opportunities to save money from this huge sum without restricting necessary travel. The administrative costs, for example, are shockingly bloated. The cost of completing a travel voucher is about \$15 in the private sector while it runs as high as \$123 in the Federal sector. We should learn something from the private sector.

There are several obstacles standing in the way of efficient and affordable Government travel. Consider for example that the agency managers simply do not have complete travel information available to them. As a result, it is impossible to effectively analyze their travel budgets in order to locate waste and reduce costs. The reason is simple. The governmentwide travel charge card is not used for many travel arrangements. This means valuable information that would be recorded on a credit card invoice is never gathered.

The solution is uniform use of the travel card. This bill provides for uniform use with certain necessary exceptions. Agencies need clear authority to obtain information regarding the travel card issued to its employees. The agencies must be able to verify that charges are business related. This bill gives them that authority. This will make the Federal Government a better customer, which will in turn increase the size of the rebate that the Government receives.

The Travel and Transportation Reform Act of 1997 contains several other provisions along these lines as well as authority to participate in travel pilot test programs. The idea is to clear away obstacles to better management, to encourage a concerted effort to improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of Federal travel.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of H.R. 930 for inclusion in the RECORD:

H.R. 930

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Travel and Transportation Reform Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE USE OF THE TRAVEL CHARGE CARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under regulations issued by the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator may require that Federal employees use the travel charge card established pursuant to the United States Travel and Transportation Payment and Expense Control System, or any Federal contractor-issued travel charge, for all payments of expenses of official Government travel. The Administrator shall exempt any payment, person, type or class of payments, or type or class of personnel from any requirement established under the preceding sentence in any case in which—

(1) it is in the best interest of the United States to do so;

(2) payment through a travel charge card is impractical or imposes unreasonable burdens or costs on Federal employees or Federal agencies; or

(3) the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Transportation (with respect to the Coast Guard) requests an exemption with respect to the members of the uniformed services.

(b) LIMITATION ON RESTRICTION ON DISCLOSURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1113 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3413) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(q) Nothing in this title shall apply to the disclosure of any financial record or information to a Government authority in conjunction with a Federal contractor-issued travel charge card issued for official Government travel."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) is effective as of October 1, 1983, and applies to any records created pursuant to the United States Travel and Transportation Payment and Expense Control System or any Federal contractor-issued travel charge card issued for official Government travel.

(c) COLLECTION OF AMOUNTS OWED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Under regulations issued by the Administrator of General Services and upon written request of a Federal contractor, the head of any Federal agency may, on behalf of the contractor, collect by deduction from the amount of pay owed to an employee of the agency any amount of funds the employee owes to the contractor as a result of delinquencies on a travel charge card issued for payment of expenses incurred in connection with official Government travel. The amount deducted from the pay owed to an employee with respect to a pay period may not exceed 15 percent of the net pay of the employee for that pay period, except that a greater percentage may be deducted upon the written consent of the employee.

(2) DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS.—Collection under this subsection shall be carried out in accordance with procedures substantially equivalent to the procedures required under section 3716(a) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this subsection:

(A) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning that term has under section 101 of title 31, United States Code.

(B) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" means an individual employed in or under an

agency, including a member of any of the uniformed services. For purposes of this subsection, a member of one of the uniformed services is an employee of that uniformed service.

(C) **MEMBER; UNIFORMED SERVICE.**—Each of the terms “member” and “uniformed service” has the meaning that term has in section 101 of title 37, United States Code.

(d) **DELAYED IMPLEMENTATION.**—The Administrator may delay implementation of subsections (a) and (c) by up to 5 years if the Administrator determines that it is in the best interests of the United States to do so.

SEC. 3. PREPAYMENT AUDITS OF TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—(1) Section 3322 of title 31, United States Code, is amended in subsection (c) by inserting after “classifications” the following: “if the Administrator of General Services has determined that verification by a prepayment audit conducted pursuant to section 3726(a) of this title for a particular mode or modes of transportation, or for an agency or subagency, will not adequately protect the interests of the Government”.

(2) Section 3528 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end of subsection (a)(4)(C) and inserting “; and”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) verifying transportation rates, freight classifications, and other information provided on a Government bill of lading or transportation request, unless the Administrator of General Services has determined that verification by a prepayment audit conducted pursuant to section 3726(a) of this title for a particular mode or modes of transportation, or for an agency or subagency, will not adequately protect the interests of the Government.”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting after “deductions” the following: “and the Administrator of General Services has determined that verification by a prepayment audit conducted pursuant to section 3726(a) of this title for a particular mode or modes of transportation, or for an agency or subagency, will not adequately protect the interests of the Government”; and

(C) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting after “agreement” the following: “and the Administrator of General Services has determined that verification by a prepayment audit conducted pursuant to section 3726(a) of this title for a particular mode or modes of transportation, or for an agency or subagency, will not adequately protect the interests of the Government”.

(3) Section 3726 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a)(1) Each agency that receives a bill from a carrier or freight forwarder for transporting an individual or property for the United States Government shall verify its correctness (to include transportation rates, freight classifications, or proper combinations thereof), using prepayment audit, prior to payment in accordance with the requirements of this section and regulations prescribed by the Administrator of General Services.

“(2) The Administrator of General Services may exempt bills, a particular mode or modes of transportation, or an agency or subagency from a prepayment audit and verification and in lieu thereof require a postpayment audit, based on cost effective-

ness, public interest, or other factors the Administrator considers appropriate.

“(3) Expenses for prepayment audits shall be funded by the agency’s appropriations used for the transportation services.

“(4) The audit authority provided to agencies by this section is subject to oversight by the Administrator.”;

(B) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) in order as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively;

(C) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

“(b) The Administrator may conduct pre- or postpayment audits of transportation bills of any Federal agency. The number and types of bills audited shall be based on the Administrator’s judgment.

“(c)(1) The Administrator shall adjudicate transportation claims which cannot be resolved by the agency procuring the transportation services, or the carrier or freight-forwarder presenting the bill.

“(2) A claim under this section shall be allowed only if it is received by the Administrator not later than 3 years (excluding time of war) after the later of the following dates:

“(A) The date of accrual of the claim.

“(B) The date payment for the transportation is made.

“(C) The date a refund for an overpayment for the transportation is made.

“(D) The date a deduction under subsection (d) of this section is made.”;

(D) in subsection (f), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (e)”, and by adding at the end the following new sentence: “This reporting requirement expires December 31, 1998.”;

(E) in subsection (i)(1), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(F) by adding after subsection (i), as so redesignated, the following new subsection:

“(j) The Administrator of General Services may provide transportation audit and related technical assistance services, on a reimbursable basis, to any other Federal entity or to any other activity. Such reimbursements may be credited to the appropriate revolving fund or appropriation from which the expenses were incurred.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall become effective 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. REIMBURSEMENT FOR TAXES ON MONEY RECEIVED FOR TRAVEL EXPENSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5706b the following new section:

“§5706c. Reimbursement for taxes incurred on money received for travel expenses

“(a) Under regulations prescribed pursuant to section 5707 of this title, the head of an agency or department, or his or her designee, may use appropriations or other funds available to the agency for administrative expenses, for the reimbursement of Federal, State, and local income taxes incurred by an employee of the agency or by an employee and such employee’s spouse (if filing jointly), for any travel or transportation reimbursement made to an employee for which reimbursement or an allowance is provided.

“(b) Reimbursements under this section shall include an amount equal to all income taxes for which the employee and spouse, as the case may be, would be liable due to the reimbursement for the taxes referred to in subsection (a). In addition, reimbursements under this section shall include penalties and interest, for the tax years 1993 and 1994 only, as a result of agencies failing to withhold the

appropriate amounts for tax liabilities of employees affected by the change in the deductibility of travel expenses made by Public Law 102-486.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5706b the following new item:

“5706c. Reimbursement for taxes incurred on money received for travel expenses.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall be effective as of January 1, 1993.

SEC. 5. AUTHORITY FOR TEST PROGRAMS.

(a) **TRAVEL EXPENSES TEST PROGRAMS.**—Subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§5710. Authority for travel expenses test programs

“(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, under a test program which the Administrator of General Services determines to be in the interest of the Government and approves, an agency may pay for a period not to exceed 24 months any necessary travel expenses in lieu of any payment otherwise authorized or required under this subchapter. An agency shall include in any request to the Administrator for approval of such a test program an analysis of the expected costs and benefits and a set of criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

“(b) The Administrator shall transmit a copy of any test program approved by the Administrator under this section to the appropriate committees of the Congress at least 30 days before the effective date of the program.

“(c) An agency authorized to conduct a test program under subsection (a) shall provide to the Administrator and the appropriate committees of the Congress a report on the results of the program no later than 3 months after completion of the program.

“(d) No more than 10 test programs under this section may be conducted simultaneously.

“(e) The authority to conduct test programs under this section shall expire 7 years after the date of enactment of the Travel and Transportation Reform Act of 1997.”.

(b) **RELOCATION EXPENSES TEST PROGRAMS.**—Subchapter II of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§5737. Authority for relocation expenses test programs

“(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, under a test program which the Administrator of General Services determines to be in the interest of the Government and approves, an agency may pay for a period not to exceed 24 months any necessary relocation expenses in lieu of any payment otherwise authorized or required under this subchapter. An agency shall include in any request to the Administrator for approval of such a test program an analysis of the expected costs and benefits and a set of criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

“(b) The Administrator shall transmit a copy of any test program approved by the Administrator under this section to the appropriate committees of the Congress at least 30 days before the effective date of the program.

“(c) An agency authorized to conduct a test program under subsection (a) shall provide to the Administrator and the appropriate committees of the Congress a report

on the results of the program no later than 3 months after completion of the program.

"(d) No more than 10 test programs under this section may be conducted simultaneously.

"(e) The authority to conduct test programs under this section shall expire 7 years after the date of enactment of the Travel and Transportation Reform Act of 1997."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is further amended by—

(1) inserting after the item relating to section 5709 the following new item:

"5710. Authority for travel expenses test programs.";

and

(2) inserting after the item relating to section 5737 the following new item:

"5737. Authority for relocation expenses test programs."

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, 105TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of House rule XI, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Rules of Procedure for the Committee on the Budget for the 105th Congress. The Budget Committee adopted its rules on February 4, 1997 in a public meeting by a rollcall vote.

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

Rule 1—Applicability of House Rules

Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House are the rules of the committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege.

MEETINGS

Rule 2—Regular meetings

(a) The regular meeting day of the committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session.

(b) The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting when the chairman determines there is no business to be considered by the committee. The chairman shall give notice in writing or by facsimile to that effect to each member of the committee as far in advance of the regular meeting day as the circumstances permit.

(c) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

Rule 3—Additional and special meetings

(a) The chairman may call and convene additional meetings of the committee as the chairman considers necessary, or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(c).

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the chairman shall provide notice in writing or by facsimile of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least 3 days in advance when Congress is not in session.

Rule 4—Open business meetings

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the committee, in open session and

with a quorum present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(1).

(b) No person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the committee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

Rule 5—Quorums

A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

Rule 6—Recognition

Any member, when recognized by the chairman, may address the committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

Rule 7—Consideration of business

Measures or matters may be placed before the committee, for its consideration, by the chairman or by a majority vote of the members of the committee, a quorum being present.

Rule 8—Procedure for consideration of budget resolution

(a) It shall be the policy of the committee that the starting point for any deliberations on a concurrent resolution on the budget should be the estimated or actual levels for the fiscal year preceding the budget year.

(b) In developing a concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the committee open to amendment; subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters which have already been amended in their entirety.

(c) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

Rule 9—Rollcall votes

A rollcall of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a rollcall may be had on the request of any member.

HEARINGS

Rule 10—Announcement of hearings

The chairman shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least 1 week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

Rule 11—Open hearings

(a) Each hearing conducted by the committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by rollcall vote

that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The committee or task forces may be the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes of House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(2), the task forces of the committee are considered to be subcommittees.

Rule 12—Quorums

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

Rule 13—Time for questioning witnesses

(a) Committee members shall have not to exceed 5 minutes to interrogate each witness until such time as each member who so desires has had an opportunity to interrogate such witness.

(b) After all members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round shall begin again under the 5-minute rule.

(c) In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule, the chairman and the ranking minority member may be recognized first, after which members may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing. Among the members present at the time the hearing is called to order, seniority shall be recognized. In recognizing members to question witnesses, the chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

Rule 14—Subpoenas and oaths

(a) In accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(m) subpoenas authorized by a majority of the committee may be issued over the signature of the chairman or of any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member.

(b) The chairman, or any member of the committee designated by the chairman, may administer oaths to witnesses.

Rule 15—Witnesses' statements

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the 2 preceding fiscal years.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

Rule 16—Committee prints

All committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the committee.

Rule 17—Committee publications on the Internet

To the maximum extent feasible, the committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

Rule 18—Committee staff

(a)(1) Subject to approval by the committee, and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical staff of the committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the chairman.

(2) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, creed, sex, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(3) All committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(4) Notwithstanding paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, staff shall be employed in compliance with House Rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

(b) Associate staff for members of the committee may be appointed only at the discretion of the chairman (in consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party associate staff), after taking into consideration any staff ceilings and budgetary constraints in effect at the time, and any terms, limits, or conditions established by the Committee on House Oversight under clause 6 of House Rule XI. Such staff members shall be compensated at a rate, determined by the member, not to exceed \$60,000 per year from the committee's budget. Members shall not appoint more than one person pursuant to these provisions. Members designating a staff member under this subsection must certify by letter to the chairman that the employee is needed and will be utilized for committee work and, to the extent space is available, will spend no less than 10 hours per week in committee offices performing committee work.

Rule 19—Staff supervision

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 6(c)) and job titles, and, in his discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the committee, who may delegate such authority as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

Rule 20—Preparation and maintenance of committee records

(a) An accurate stenographic record shall be made of all hearings and business meetings.

(b) The proceedings of the committee shall be recorded in a journal which shall, among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) Members of the committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The chairman may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impede the committee's responsibility for meeting its dead-

lines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the chairman decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

Rule 21—Access to committee records

(a)(1) The chairman shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of rollcall votes and to provide access by members to committee records (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(e)).

(2) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to Members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and stenographic reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(3) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the committee members. Such information shall be kept in the committee safe, and shall be available to members in the committee office.

(b) The records of the committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the committee.

OVERSIGHT

Rule 22—General oversight

(a) The committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause (1)(d)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5 of rule XI, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Oversight and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight in accordance with the provisions of clause (2)(d) of House Rule X.

REPORTS

Rule 23—Availability before filing

No committee report on a bill or resolution shall be filed with the House until copies of the proposed report have been available to all members for at least 36 hours prior to filing, unless the chairman deems it necessary to waive this requirement. No material change (other than the filing of supplemental, minority, or additional views by any member) shall be made in the report distributed to members unless agreed to by majority vote or authorized by the chairman with the concurrence of the ranking minority member.

Rule 24—Report on the budget resolution

The report of the committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include a comparison of the estimated or actual levels for the year preceding the budget year with the proposed spending and revenue levels for the budget year and each out year along with the appropriate percentage increase or decrease for each budget function

and aggregate. The report shall include any rollcall vote on any motion to amend or report any measure.

Rule 25—Parliamentarian's Status Report and Section 302 Status Report

(a)(1) In order to carry out its duty under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) The committee authorizes the chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b)(1) In order to carry out its duty under section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Budget Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The committee authorizes the chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

Rule 26—Activity report

After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the chair of the committee may file any time with the Clerk the committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause (1)(d)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the committee for at least 7 calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the committee.

MISCELLANEOUS

Rule 27—Broadcasting of meetings and hearings

(a) It shall be the policy of the committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in House Rule XI, clause 3.

(b) Whenever any committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 3.

Rule 28—Appointment of conferees

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the chairman subject to the approval of the majority party members of the committee.

(b) The chairman shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the committee.

Rule 29—Waivers

When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman may, if practical, consult with the committee members on whether the chairman should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the act by not waiving the applicable points of order during the consideration of such measure.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PEASE]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk primarily today about the Supreme Court decision with respect to voting rights in New York City. They have of course come down with a decision in New York that obeys the Supreme Court decision and the precedent it set. So the courts have ordered that one district, the district of my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ], the 12th Congressional District of New York, be redrawn; and the courts have said this must take place by July 30. The legislature has until July 30 to redraw the district.

I think that this process has been going on for some time now. We understood that the Supreme Court, when it made its decision on the Georgia case and the North Carolina cases and the Texas case, all those cases let us know that it was almost inevitable that eventually some district in New York that was being challenged would be struck down and the district that has the oddest shape of course was the 12th Congressional District, presently held by Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ.

We knew it was coming but nevertheless my neighbors seemed very alarmed. In the surrounding area, people are alarmed. The whole city is alarmed, asking questions as if this was a brand new situation. So for that reason, I find it important to comment. I have been on about four radio stations, and the kinds of questions I receive show that previous discussions of this matter, and I have spoken on the floor at least twice about the Voting Rights Act and the implications of the Voting Rights Act, the reason for the Voting Rights Act, the justice of the Voting Rights Act, but at home it has not come through because they did not feel it concerned them. It was in Georgia, North Carolina, Texas, Louisiana, recently Virginia. Now it has come home to New York.

So it is important, and I think that the fact that Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ is appealing the decision is important. She knows that the likelihood that that appeal will be upheld,

the likelihood that her appeal will receive success is very slim. She wants to make the point that the decision has come down, and it is a district court ruling in a matter that they consider consistent with the Supreme Court and the inevitability of that is one thing but the justice of it is another.

It is not just that the Supreme Court that set the process in motion was wrong, that it was a 5 to 4 decision. Any 5 to 4 decision should be questioned and questioned. The morality of it, the legality of it, all should be questioned, and she did not want to accept that.

So we set in motion a process of having a dialog in New York that should have been going on all along because there is something more at stake here than just the redrawing of lines at one time. The whole act, the Voting Rights Act and the essence of the Voting Rights Act is now in jeopardy because the principle applied to congressional districts is also to be applied to State legislative districts and also city council districts and any other jurisdiction of the government, same principles would be applied. So it is a matter that deserves extensive discussion.

Now, in the process of this discussion, I want to also talk about a few other things that seem unrelated but I intend to put them together, I assure you. I want to talk about some good news that has taken place in the past 24 hours. The Swiss Government announced that they were going to set up a \$5 billion fund to compensate or to help victims of catastrophes, especially victims of human rights violations, such as victims of the Holocaust. Let me just make it clear that this is a Swiss Government taking this action, following an action that was previously taken by the Swiss banks. The Swiss banks already established a fund, I think, of 100-some million dollars, a fund to directly compensate victims of the Holocaust.

Now the Swiss Government, the President of Switzerland has gone further, and that act of reconciliation is what I want to talk about. Where does reconciliation come in the process of evaluating the justice or injustice of the Voting Rights Act?

□ 1615

What is the Voting Rights Act all about? Why was the Voting Rights Act, why is the Voting Rights Act being questioned on the basis of race, on the basis of its denial of equal rights?

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor argues in the majority opinion that we cannot draw a district with predominant consideration of race. That violates the equal protection clause in the 14th amendment.

What Justice Sandra Day O'Connor does not tell us is that the 14th amendment is not about equal protection for everybody in a colorblind society. The

14th amendment is about a remedy of slavery.

The 14th amendment came about as a result of the need to take care of the long pattern of injustices established in 232 years of slavery. And when the Civil War was fought and finally won, Congress had to pass first the 13th amendment, which freed the slaves. Abraham Lincoln freed a certain segment of the slaves in the Emancipation Proclamation, but he did not free all the slaves and it was not a constitutional matter.

A President can issue an Executive order. When he goes out of office, the Executive order no longer applies. So the Emancipation Proclamation did not free the slaves permanently. It was the 13th amendment.

Following the 13th amendment was the 14th amendment, which talked at great length about slavery. Most people think the 14th amendment is a little line about equal protection under the law. That is only one tiny part of the 14th amendment. The 14th amendment is about slavery and certain steps that the Government had to take to remedy the effects of slavery and to deal with the people who are now the descendants of slaves.

So the Swiss Government's action is a process of reconciliation dealing with what they did not do 50 years ago, 50 years ago when the Nazis invaded most of Europe. The Nazis subjected the Jews to the Holocaust, 6 million people being wiped out. They stole their money and their goods and so forth. A lot of the gold and the money of Jewish victims of the Holocaust ended up in Switzerland. It was generally understood for the last 50 years that that had happened. Only now is Switzerland, under great pressure, finally beginning to deal with that.

And I would like to applaud the positive step taken by the Swiss Government. Was it justice? I doubt it. It is at least a positive step in the process of reconciliation. And I will come back to that.

Most important of all, I would like to show how the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of the South African Government is a model that even America ought to take a look at, because we have all these leftover problems resulting from 232 years of slavery and we are not able to deal with the problems in an effective, honest, and just way unless we admit that there was a great crime committed; unless we admit that there was a great problem created for 232 years; that the descendants of African slaves for 232 years they were enslaved and they have some problems and the Nation owes them something and we ought to talk about that.

We ought to talk about what we are going to do to rectify those problems. And even before we get to rectifying the problems, let us at least tell the truth about it. Let us at least have a

national exploration of what it meant to have 232 years of slavery, 232 years where people could not acquire wealth, 232 years where there was an attempt to obliterate the humanity of a certain group of people in order to make them more efficient and effective as beasts of burden.

I am repeating myself. I have said this a couple of times on the floor before. But I think it is important to review these things, because in New York they are just beginning to wake up to the fact that we have a problem with respect to the Voting Rights Act. A lot of the people I talk to, and a lot of people who called into the radio shows said, well, it is only fair that we not consider race, that we not consider color. We should have a colorblind society.

It is hard to deal with that discussion unless we deal with history. Now, I am not a historian. I majored in mathematics. I was never that fond of history, but I have as I have grown older begun to understand and appreciate the power of history. And history is what civilization is all about. If we do not remember history, or respect history or learn from history, then we are not able to build a civilization. We cannot deal with truth unless we have it in the context of history.

So the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission seems like it is a long way away from the Voting Rights Act and it does not seem related. It may seem like it is not related to the Swiss Government action today, but it is all a part of what I want to talk about today.

I want to go further and talk about beyond the Voting Rights Act; that there is a need for a whole lot of other actions and activities of Government that now will never take place unless we begin to look at the impact of 232 years of slavery, and, after that, about 150 years of special discrimination, oppression.

The fact that the reconciliation process is gaining momentum, the fact that the reconciliation process is now accepted, beginning to make an impact, an imprint on our overall world civilization is very important.

It may be that the steps being taken are only tiny steps, but what was the liberation of Haiti all about? The liberation of Haiti was accomplished because we made promises that we would not punish, we would not seek justice, we would just seek the truth and reconciliation. Punishment of the people who had thrown out the legal Government of Haiti and terrorized the people for 3 years; our Government said that should not take place. And Aristide and the Government of Haiti agreed. We will not emphasize punishment, we will emphasize reconciliation.

What happened in Bosnia? We had to have some agreement among the fighting parties that they would not pursue

justice over reconciliation. Yes, there is a clause which says that war criminals will be sought, but the definition of war criminals makes it pretty clear we are talking about a very tiny amount of people. Most of the people who participated in the terror, in the war crimes, and the devastation of the Balkan countries involved, the old Yugoslavia, parts of Yugoslavia, they will not be punished. We are pursuing reconciliation there.

The Swiss Government's action is another act of reconciliation. In Uganda, where they massacred a half million people in a short period of time, one tribe after another, we are trying to pursue reconciliation. Reconciliation is being pursued in Uganda, but the courts are holding forth, cases are being tried, they are trying to get the truth of what happened. It is important before they go forward.

What I am saying is that unless we have a bedrock of truth on which to build the future, building the present and future gets kind of wobbly. We threw away the Voting Rights Act and said no group should be treated in a special way. Well, we moved from the Voting Rights Act to the set-asides. Set-asides for minorities and women have now been discouraged by the Supreme Court because that is treating a group in a special way.

The Supreme Court did say that the Federal Government had a right to pursue any remedies it wanted to with respect to past injustices. So Federal set-asides were accepted, whereas local set-asides would only be accepted if they proved there was immediate discrimination or past discrimination that could be proved. It was a complicated way of diluting the understanding that if there are injustices that have gone on for a long time, Government has a duty to try to correct and adjust the situation in order to compensate for those injustices.

The German Government is made up of people who are living and breathing now, citizens paying taxes, many of them were not alive during the Nazi era, yet the Germans have steadfastly paid reparations to certain identified Jewish victims of the Holocaust.

The Germans have had to pay for a number of other things, because a nation is considered a continuing body and we do not drop whatever is happening because it was a group called the Nazis or the Gestapo. The German Government has to assume that responsibility.

The Swiss Government of today was not the Swiss Government that was there when they capitulated to the Germans and they acted in concert with the Germans in the looting of certain fortunes and a number of things that went on, which the Government of Switzerland is not even acknowledging today, but they are saying we understand something went wrong and today

we are going to move forward and try to, in the spirit of reconciliation, do something positive.

The principle of special treatment to deal with special past crimes, special past injustices, special past investigations is what I am talking about: special treatment in the Voting Rights Act, special treatment we need in the emergency funding of education right now.

The same people that were victimized by 232 years of slavery are the descendants of those people, and they are the ones being victimized in our big cities right now. They are being victimized because children are being forced to go to school in buildings that are unsafe. Not only are they not conducive to learning but the buildings have asbestos problems, they have lead poisoning problems, they have problems of overcrowding which affects the psyche as well as the physical health of children. Those things are going on right now in America.

The need to deal with that on an emergency basis and understand that there is a need to do that because the situation results from past injustices and past failures must go forward.

There is a need for more empowerment zones. We came up with a good solution, which the Republicans and Democrats both bought into, when the President proposed that we have empowerment zones in big cities and also in rural areas where we have a large amount of poverty. The empowerment zone concept was considered a great step forward because it combined the private sector effort with the public sector effort.

When empowerment zones were first proposed, the number 50 was the magic number. For a long time they talked about 50 empowerment zones. A good idea that everybody endorsed then, and it is a good idea still to endorse. But we went from 50 empowerment zones on the drawing board down to 9 empowerment zones when they finally enacted the legislation, 6 in the big cities and 3 in rural areas.

The President began to talk during the election of our increasing the empowerment zones from 9 to 20, which we thought was still too few, but in his State of the Union Address he fell back from 20 to talking about 6 additional empowerment zones.

So empowerment zones are part of an effort to correct past injustices, part of an effort to deal with the special problems created by oppression and the victimization of people. And empowerment zones should be pushed forward and expanded. We need more of them and we need them now, not a trickle-down approach where by the year 2000 we may have 20. We need to deal with the problem right now.

Empowerment zones rightly focus on the poorest areas in the country. We have to prove poverty. In my district

we have census tracks, which are the census tracks from which most of the children with asthma come. They are the census tracks from which most of the children who have not graduated from high school come. They are the census tracks which have the largest numbers of people in the prisons in New York State.

There is a correlation between extreme poverty. We have census tracks with a large number of low-income housing developments. Low-income housing developments are there because people need housing, but it groups people in low income and there is a correlation between the low income and the low education. There is a correlation between the crime rate and the health problems. Clearly, it qualifies for an empowerment zone.

There is no problem once we get the opportunity. But if we only have nine empowerment zones in the whole country and only six of those empowerment zones are urban areas, and the other gentleman from New York, CHARLIE RANGEL, was the author of the bill, so he has the one in New York City, in Harlem, which is a long way from Brooklyn. Just across the river in psychological terms, but Brooklyn, NY, is part of New York City. It has 2.5 million people, 2.5 million people.

If it was a separate city, it would be the fourth or fifth largest city in the country. We have problems there which are concentrated. And if the empowerment zones were to be distributed in an equitable and just manner, we would get an empowerment zone. I have told my constituents this is the No. one priority on my agenda, an empowerment zone.

But in the process of trying to get an economic empowerment zone, we are up against the philosophy that seems to be prevailing that we should not give special treatment to people in need. That same philosophy that mitigates against the Voting Rights Act, mitigates against the set-aside laws, is now operating in anything where we propose to help people in great need, except of course in the case of earthquakes, floods, and hurricanes.

When we have storms or natural disasters, we immediately rush to the aid of people. We have appropriated like \$8 billion in aid to California in the last 3 years, \$6 billion for Florida, and \$6 billion for Midwestern States for floods. Florida suffered from hurricanes.

□ 1630

We quickly respond and understand people are in special need when natural disasters occur, but 232 years of slavery and the byproducts of that, the poisonous legacy of that, we do not want to consider. So we need emergency education funding, we need economic empowerment zones, we need workfare to end and have Federal job creation programs instead of putting people on

workfare, which is a prelude, a prerequisite for a new kind of slavery because you are working people for less than minimum wage, no fringe benefits, dehumanizing them. Workfare becomes a prelude to slavery if it has no opportunity at the end, if there is no job training promise, if there is no attempt to build a situation in the economy where jobs will be available, public sector jobs are not being created. Then you are moving in a direction of slavery.

Mr. Speaker, the cruelty of the welfare reform and the immigration reform is coming home to my district. My office is packed with people, old people who have been in this country for 20 or 30 years, for one reason or another did not become citizens, no chance now that they are going to be able to meet the requirements, pass the tests, answer the questions. They are going to now have to starve because they cannot get food stamps, they cannot get any benefits, SSI is closed to them. They cannot get into nursing homes when they get sick. All of that goes down the drain.

The cruelty of it is unnecessary. Perhaps the average American citizen would not sit still and accept this if they understood what it is all about in terms of the legacy of injustices and past failures and how that produces a large number of people in this kind of condition.

As I said before, I want to talk primarily about the Voting Rights Act and its impact on New York City in terms of the need to draw new lines and the implications of the fact that the courts have now chosen to abandon any special considerations in the drawing of those lines, special considerations that are needed with respect to race.

So I have a potpourri of things I am throwing in here that all relate back to the same subject. I go a little further, I would like to call attention to the fact that the Chinese criticize human rights violations in America today. Some of us have voted year after year that we should not have most favorable trading status with China because China on a massive scale violates human rights. They have got more humans in China, so they can violate rights on a scale that makes everybody else appear to be playing games. When you have more than 1 billion people and you violate human rights, you are violating quite a number of humans, the rights of quite a number of humans.

So China has been criticized, but the present administration, our administration, the Democratic administration, and I think the leadership of the Republican Party also approves it. They place trade and business first, and they keep certifying China and allowing it to have most favorable nation status.

Mr. Speaker, China is not grateful for the fact that we criticize them but still give them the most favorable nation status. They have now fought back and they are criticizing the United States for violating human rights. They say we violate human rights by not providing for food, clothing and shelter for all the people, for health care for all the people, for jobs for all the people. China has slapped back at the United States. They have even gone so far as to criticize our election process.

The latest criticism of China is that we are allowing people to buy elections, that the large amounts of money that go into our elections constitute bribery. That is the charge of the Chinese. I think that we should take note. Although I do not agree with the Chinese, I think our arrogance in criticizing the rest of the world should be tempered. There are a lot of problems wrong here. We need to take a close look at ourselves.

What I am saying is that that is what we need in order to put in perspective problems relating to voting rights, problems related to appropriations for education, appropriations for jobs, economic development, problems related to our fantastic hostility toward the poor as expressed in welfare reform, immigration reform. We need to take a step back and take a look at the richest nation that ever existed on the face of the Earth and say to ourselves, how are we really behaving.

A truth and reconciliation commission would help us do this. If we understood ourselves and understood the history of this Nation and how it did not come into being automatically, by some magic process and waving of the hands of God, there were a lot of things done right by our Founding Fathers, and there were a lot of things done wrong in the economic sector. Slavery was an engine that built the Nation, helped to build the Nation economically. The wiping out of large portions of the Native American population also helped to build a new Nation economically, but it was built on the blood and bones of people who did not deserve what they got.

So we need to take a step back and look at our history and evaluate it. Ken Burns has a documentary that played a couple of weeks ago on Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson was a very complex man, also a very great man, a giant; so ordinary people are not expected to be able to really understand the psyche of Thomas Jefferson fully. He was the kind of individual who comes only once or twice or a few times in a century. He was equivalent in politics to Einstein in science as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Speaker, if there had been no Thomas Jefferson, I do not think there would be an America as we know it today. We would have a very different constellation. So Thomas Jefferson

ranks with Lincoln, competes with Lincoln as the greatest American President in my opinion. Perhaps Lincoln is greater because he acted decisively in very complicated, trying circumstances, and Thomas Jefferson acted decisively in some times but he backed away from many other battles; and that may be the difference. But historians have ranked Presidents, and I think Jefferson, Roosevelt, Lincoln, they all rank in the top three, one way or another.

Jefferson certainly was a great President. Jefferson, however, did have slaves. He was a southerner. He was a plantation owner. Jefferson also, documents show, had a 38-year love affair with one of his slaves named Sally Hemings. Sally Hemings is sort of blotted out of history, but researchers have reconstructed enough about her to let us know that she had a relationship with Jefferson for 38 years. I think a truth and reconciliation commission would help us to unearth that, and we would benefit a great deal. It is a love story that I think needs to be told, the story of Sally Hemings and Thomas Jefferson. It would help the Nation a whole lot to know exactly how this great man, why this great man maintained a relationship with a slave woman for 38 years. If that could happen, I do not think it should be seen as something to be hidden, it is something to be proud of. Obviously it was no passing passion. Obviously it was no exploitation of one human being over another. You do not do that for 38 years.

Obviously Sally Hemings was a very exceptional person even though history has blotted out a lot of what she was, and we do not know because certain Jefferson letters and documents are mysteriously missing, et cetera. But Ken Burns' documentary on Jefferson has titillated a lot of discussion. Certainly my interest, which started like 10 years ago, in Thomas Jefferson has been renewed. This is a part of our history that a Truth and Reconciliation Commission should take a look at. We may be proud and learn a lot from an examination of the intimate life of Thomas Jefferson as well as the rest of his life.

I think that factual history has a major role in this process of reconciliation. Factual history would make us understand more about what 232 years of slavery meant. Factual history, as we examine the facts more closely, if we funded a commission and they looked at it more closely, you might understand what I mean when I say that 232 years of slavery was an obliteration process, an attempt to obliterate the humanity of a set of people to make them more efficient as workers, as beasts of burden. The facts of history would help us understand that. The facts would lead us to do some of the things that have been done re-

cently in the study of the children of Romania.

In Romania, the Communist Government of Romania decided that children were better off raised in orphanages. Large numbers of children were put into orphanages. They could have found families in many cases for them, but it was a policy of the Government: Maximize the number of children in orphanages; let the State raise them.

What you have is a kind of small Holocaust related to little children. Large numbers of American families have attempted to adopt some of those Romanian children since the wall went down in Romania and the dictator who started all this was executed by the people of Romania. They have gone in, large numbers of Americans wanting to adopt children. In many cases the children were physically beautiful, a little malnourished and pathetic looking but physically beautiful, and they have run up against a very interesting problem. Many of them have found when you try to transport children of Romania into America, give them the nurturing and do everything that a parent could do, and most of these are middle-class people because it costs about \$10,000 to go through the process of getting them adopted, so they have some means. They take care of the kids very well. They run up against the problem of the children cannot do certain things, that something has happened to them that makes it impossible for them to relate in the usual human ways. Some of the parents have had to give up the children, have just found that it is impossible.

Psychiatrists have been brought in to study the situation. They have actually taken photographs, taken x-rays of the brains of the children. They have found a pattern where parts of the brain atrophy, they shrink because of the lack of human contact. These people were put in places where they were in pens. They had only other children there of their same age, very little human contact except to feed them. And often they were not fed on time and deprived. But the big thing is the lack of the human contact has led to a condition that can be documented. The brains have been affected on most of the children.

There are a few exceptions, which is a testament to the human spirit and the human endurance that is there, but the majority of them are in a situation where they do not come back. You cannot deal with the problem that the brain has already shrunk. They have documented evidence of this. I saw it on public television. I watch a lot of public television, and I saw it. They actually had the graphs and the charts, the picture of the brain, et cetera.

I asked myself, what happened to the brains of all these slave children who were put in situations where they were taken care of in the same way, only in

worse conditions. They did not have pens. They were put on dirt floors. They were put on floors that in the wintertime only were covered with straw. They were fed like pigs. They would put the milk and the cornbread together and spread it in a trowl the way they feed pigs. They went through all these kind of inhumane conditions, they were sold back and forth from their parents, all kinds of things happened. What if we were to really get a thorough documentation of what that phenomenon was like and then begin to understand what impact it had on generations, to have all those babies who became adults, who went through that process.

Mr. Speaker, how much of that is a part of the problem that we are experiencing? And what a great thing it was that the human spirit of most African-Americans who are alive today, they are still alive because their ancestors overcame those kinds of conditions. But that is just one horrendous example. Why do we not have an economic study of what it means to have a slave family, 232 years ago, that is about seven or eight generations we are talking about. And each generation, because they are slaves, cannot pass anything on to the next generation.

There have been studies that show clearly that most wealth in America has been accumulated from inheritance. One generation passes money down to the next. They invest that or they find ways to expand on that, they pass it down to the next. So wealth in America is primarily, and probably all over the world, is primarily the result of inheritance. Bill Gates is a great exception. There are a number of people who have sort of broken out of the mold, made billions of dollars due to technological advancements. They are very fortunate. But in general, studies have shown that wealth is a product of family, inheritance.

Two hundred thirty-two years went by where African-Americans and their descendants inherited zero. Nothing. They are different from the immigrants who came here who might have had a suitcase full of clothes. You had wealth if you came with a suitcase full of clothes.

□ 1645

The African Americans came, and an attempt was made to deprive them not only of everything they had—they were automatically deprived of every physical thing they had, but their language was considered a problem. So they were divided up in ways which placed people who spoke different languages together in order for them not to be able to generate conspiracies. They were in every way deprived of any heritage, traditions, folkways, mores. All that was deliberately blotted out.

So what if we really studied that seriously, had a commission which had

some funding, and were to see the impact of it? What impact would that have on our policy making, our attitudes toward policy making? We might discover some good things, you know, in the process.

There was an article I read recently which talked about the south's hidden heritage. We discovered some positive things and some of the stereotypes that we have might be overcome, because there was an article that was in the New York Times on February 16 of this year, 1997, by Eric Foner. I picked it up and I saw the name Eric Foner, and I was very interested in the article because I have a book in my office by Eric Foner. It is a study of mulattoes, the mulattoes and the impact of mulattoes, the offspring of the slave holders, the slave owners and slave women, and he has a long catalog of various mulattoes and what happened to them and their impact, et cetera.

So Eric Foner's name attracted my attention. He is a teacher at Columbia University, teaches history there, and he is also the curator of an exhibition at the South Carolina Historical Museum. At Columbia University, New York, he is a teacher, but he is a curator of an exhibition at the South Carolina Historical Museum. That is an odd combination which I found very interesting. And his article is about the south's hidden heritage.

If we had a truth in reconciliation commission we might find out things like this, and they may contribute a great deal to the dialog and the reconciliation process. He points out in his article, which I will not read in great detail, but he points out that Mississippi, which is often singled out as being an example of the worst race relations and the worst historical—historically the worst of the slave States, that Mississippi had more Mississippians who fought for the Union than for the Confederacy. That is an interesting fact, it is an odd fact; it is a fact, I think, which if it was placed into the hopper of a reconciliation process may do some good, you know.

He points out that during the Civil War 200,000 African Americans, most of them freed slaves, fought in the Union Army. Tens of thousands of Mississippi slaves were recruited in the Union forces. Several thousand whites from Mississippi also fought under the stars and stripes. In fact more Mississippians fought for the Union than for the Confederacy.

And he goes on to talk about other Civil War monuments in the south that celebrate the south's history one way or another. He talks about the fact also that Gen. James Longstreet, a famous general for the Confederacy, General Longstreet has no monuments to him in any southern towns because after the war was over General Longstreet supported rights for the newly freed slaves, so his name up to now is mud among his compatriots in the south.

A truth in reconciliation commission might appreciate that fact, might unearth the achievements of General Longstreet after the war, and it might lead to General Longstreet being a positive force in a dialog and the development of reconciliation in America.

What am I going on with this potpourri for? It is all about trying to make the point that the Supreme Court decision on the Voting Rights Act is a landmark decision, it is a dangerous harbinger of things to come. If we do not deal with the distorted notions behind it, the philosophy of it, and understand what it is all about, we are in danger of losing other kinds of policy institutions.

We fought hard for certain institutions to be put in place. We fought hard to get the Voting Rights Act, we fought hard to end segregation in the schools, we fought hard to get set-asides established so that in Government contracts a small percentage, a tiny percentage of contracts were awarded to minorities and to women. A lot of that is being rolled back. Affirmative action is being challenged, and a lot of the same arguments that are used by the Supreme Court in its promulgation of this wrong decision are used in all of those cases, that America should be a colorblind society.

Everybody is equal. Therefore you cannot take steps to remedy anything on the basis of past injustices. You must treat everybody equally. That may be a dream that will take place some day, but it is not a fact and a reality now, and the fact that we close our eyes makes the process of building a great Nation more difficult. We may have serious problems if we continue to go down this road, but we will not acknowledge that schools in inner-city communities which have the greatest bulk of the descendants of African slaves need special help. Empowerment zones in inner-city districts need special help to create jobs and create opportunity. We cannot run away from that responsibility.

In the Supreme Court decision, I think I pointed out Supreme Court decision that was related to the Georgia case, and was used as the backbone and the ultimate decisionmaking as within the context of the Supreme Court decision for all other cases, including the recent case of New York. NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ's 12th District has been subjected to the same reasoning that was used in the Georgia case, and therefore at this point I want to go back to a statement I made on this floor before:

The Georgia case was a case decided by a five to four configuration. Five members voted for it, and four members voted against it. Ruth Bader Ginsburg wrote the opinion for the minority; Justice Kennedy wrote the opinion for the majority. Justice Kennedy based his ruling on another case which

said that you can not have any consideration of race when the Government is involved. Justice Ginsburg challenged this and said this is not so self-evident, it is not common sense. It was not obvious to Justice Ginsburg, and I will repeat what I said on the floor before:

The law, as the law is made and the intent of the constitutional amendment as examined, it is not at all clear to Justice Ginsburg that the 14th amendment is primarily concerned with being colorblind and not concerned with remedying past wrongs, which the full, legal immigration of the African Americans, the former slaves and their descendants into American life, require.

Let me read a few excerpts from Justice Ginsburg's dissenting opinion directly. Quote:

Legislative redistricting is a highly political business. This court has generally respected the competence of State legislators to attend to the task. When race is the issue, however, we have recognized the need for judicial intervention, the judicial intervention, to prevent dilution of minority voting strength. Generations of white discrimination against African Americans, as citizens and voters, account for that surveillance.

In other words, the courts did get involved with redistricting after hundreds of years of, say, you know, we are not going to draw lines. Legislatures can do a better job with that. They got involved only because there was an injustice that continued from one generation to another in representation for minorities, in most cases for the descendants of African slaves.

In other words, what she is saying is that we have generally kept our hands off the judiciary. The judiciary kept its hands off the reapportionment process. There was a series of cases that established clearly that it was better to leave the State legislatures alone to do this, and the only regular systematic intervention of the courts came in the case of the Voting Rights Act. They upheld the Voting Rights Act as being constitutional originally and proceeded for a long time to accept it and support it.

We reauthorized the Voting Rights Act for 25 years. I think it has about 15 more years to go because the Congress, after having tested it, reauthorized it 2 or 3 times for 2 years, 4 years, 5 years; finally decided to reauthorize it for 25 years. But to quote Justice Ginsburg again:

Two years ago in *Shaw versus Reno* this court took up a claim analytically distinct from a vote dilution claim. *Shaw* authorized judicial intervention in extremely regular reapportionments.

To continue quoting Justice Ginsburg:

Today the court expands the judicial role, announcing that Federal courts are to undertake searching review of any district with contours predominantly motivated by race. Strict scrutiny will be triggered not only

when traditional districting practices are abandoned, but also when those practices are subordinated to and given less weight than race. Applying this new race as predominant factor standard, the court invalidates Georgia's districting plan even though Georgia's eleventh district, the focus of today's dispute, bears the imprint of familiar districting practices. Because I do not endorse the court's new standard and will not upset Georgia's new plan, I dissent, says Justice Ginsburg on the occasion of the court case that set the precedent for what has been decided now in New York. NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ would not have been ordered to redraw lines in this case, if the court had not ruled on the Georgia case in this manner.

To continue quoting justice Ginsburg:

We say once again what has been said on many occasions. Reapportionment is primarily the duty and responsibility of the State through its legislature or other body rather than of a Federal court. Districting inevitably has sharp political impact, and political decisions must be made by those charged with the task. District lines are drawn to accommodate a myriad of factors geographic, economic, historical and political, and State legislatures as arenas of compromise, electoral accountability, are best positioned to mediate competing claims. Courts with a mandate merely to adjudicate are ill equipped for this task. The lines have been redrawn in New York City, have been ordered redrawn because the court which is ill-equipped with the task is interfering with the process, and they have never done that before. She points out geographic, economic, historical, political and number of factors go into drawing the lines of a district, a congressional district, State Senate district, assembly, all under the same process. It is a political process.

BARNEY FRANK offered the other day when I was looking for examples of strangely shaped districts, oddly shaped districts that have nothing to do with the Voting Rights Act, BARNEY FRANK offered his district. It is one of the oddest shaped districts in the country. It is in Massachusetts. Had nothing to do with the Voting Rights Act. Historically there have been stranger creatures drawn as districts than anything that we have seen put forward in these voting rights act cases, but suddenly esthetics becomes important. The odd shape, if it had something to do with race maybe, requires strict scrutiny.

I quote Justice Ginsburg again. Federal courts have ventured now into the political thicket of reapportionment when necessary to secure to members of racial minorities equal voting rights, rights denied many States including Georgia until not long ago. The 15th amendment which was ratified in 1870 declared that the right to vote shall not be denied by any State on account of race. That declaration for many generations was often honored in the breach. It was greeted by a near century of unrelenting and ingenious defiance in several States including Georgia. The defiance in Georgia and several southern States was open, well known, poll tax, lynchings of people

who tried to assert their right to vote. You wanted to vote at one point, you had to recite the constitution without stopping. In one State they require that you tell how many bubbles there are in a bar of soap. They came in with all kind of ridiculous questions for black voters who were seeking to vote.

So that is legendary. We know about that. What you do not know is that in places like New York, New York City with a large black population, they have for years, for many decades, drew lines where they went to the black community and put the pin down in the middle of the community so that a large black community would be a part of four different districts. They would have no power in any one of those four districts because they are only a small part of all those districts. It was a pattern repeated over and over again in big cities like Philadelphia, Chicago, all across the country.

□ 1700

So the politicians had the power to do that and they did it and they were allowed to do it.

The 15th amendment, ratified in 1877, said the right to vote shall not be denied by any State on account of race. That declaration for many generations was offered under the breach. After a brief interlude of black suffrage enforced by Federal troops but accompanied by rampant attacks against blacks, Georgia held a constitutional convention in 1877. Its purpose, according to the convention's leader, to quote the convention leader of the Georgia Constitution in 1877, was to fix it so that the people shall rule and the Negro shall never be heard from. This is part of the history that Justice Ginsburg quoted in order to deal with the Georgia case.

She continues, in pursuant of this objective, Georgia enacted a cumulative poll tax requiring voters to show their past as well as current poll taxes paid. One historian described this tax as the most effective bar to Negro suffrage ever devised.

In 1890, the Georgia General Assembly authorized white-only primaries. Keeping blacks out of the Democratic primary effectively excluded them from Georgia's political life. The victory in the Democratic primary in those days was tantamount to election.

Early in this century Georgia Governor Hoke Smith persuaded the legislature of Georgia to pass the Disenfranchisement Act of 1901. As late as 1901, they passed the Disenfranchisement Act of 1901. True to its title, this measure added various property, good character and leadership requirements that as administered served to keep blacks from voting. This result, as one commentator observed 25 years later, was an absolute exclusion of the Negro voice in State and Federal elections.

I am citing all of this to let my colleagues know that this is the Georgia

case that is the decisive case, the basis for striking down districts in Virginia and Texas, in Louisiana and Florida, and now in New York City. If my colleagues want to know the history, if my colleagues want to know the other side, this is the other side argued by Justice Ginsburg. She did not agree with Justice O'Connor, she did not agree with Justice Clarence Thomas, and she wrote a brilliant statement that every person in New York who is concerned about justice ought to read.

Disenfranchised blacks have no electoral influence; hence, no muscle to lobby the legislature for change, and that is when the court intervened. She is saying that the court intervened and the Voting Rights Act was created because the processes were being used to exclude and to oppress a particular group. It was a violation of the 15th amendment.

Justice Ginsburg makes it quite clear that the equal protection clause does not rule out extraordinary measures being taken by the Federal Government to deal with past wrongs and to compensate for what happened in 232 years of slavery and the period of disenfranchisement that followed. She argues, Justice Ginsburg argues, with the basic principle that is established by Justice O'Connor in *Shaw versus Reno*, she argues against that principle; she does not accept that premise.

But then Justice Ginsburg moved to another area and she showed that the 11th Congressional District that was being challenged in Georgia had better lines, less crooked lines, less strange lines; the shape was better, more rectangular than most of the other Georgia districts.

So the district of the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ] has been called the Bullwinkle district in New York. It is called the Bullwinkle district because it looks so strange; somebody says it looks like Bullwinkle. It is a big joke. But I assure my colleagues that throughout history there have been many Bullwinkles and Bullwinkle's relatives that never have been challenged. We also know that right now across the Nation, of the 435 districts drawn, some of the strangest safe districts have nothing to do with the Voting Rights Act, they have nothing to do with race.

So I come back to my original concern. People of New York, people of my district understand this Voting Rights Act is in jeopardy; the fact that a colleague of mine has been ordered to redraw her district. The question has been asked many times, how will this affect you? It will affect me immediately because I have some boundaries with the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ]. I am on the boundary of people who do have boundaries with her. So they may, in the process of redrawing the district, impact upon my district as it is now.

There are several plans that have been proposed, very modest plans. Some involve adjustments where they move the lines around a bit and a few districts will be impacted and that is it. That is one scenario. The problem could be resolved with the simple scenario of adjusting lines in a few districts. Another scenario is that since the State legislature has ordered the redrawing of all of the lines; not all of the lines, but redrawing of the lines for her district, the State legislature can choose, if they wish, to redraw all of the lines in the whole State. They have that option. They can choose to draw lines as far away as several thousand miles, in Buffalo, on the border of Canada if they wish. They have that option. Being told by the courts to redraw lines mean they have an option.

Some people in the State legislature, powerful people, the Governor is powerful, the majority leader in the senate, they are powerful Republicans, they may try to get revenge on the Democrats who won in districts that were primarily Republican, who had a large percentage of Republicans, and they may try to draw boundaries in ways which impact on those districts. Some Democrats may choose to want to make some adjustments and get even with some of their enemies by redrawing some lines somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, the scenario that does not make sense is also possible. It does not make sense to do that. The wild scenario of drawing lines throughout the State is one possibility. The scenario of common sense is to just make adjustments downstate in the area of New York City.

Now, I say all of this because it is important if people have questions, they want to know is my district in jeopardy? Why am I concerned about this? I am not concerned primarily because it impacts on my district at all. I am concerned about the future of the Voting Rights Act. I am concerned about the principle of effective Government policies to focus on problems that exist as a result of past Government behavior, past wrongs that were done, past official policies.

When the Constitution was written and they made slaves, they did not even refer to slaves. They said other individuals would be counted as three-fifths, other Indians would be counted as three-fifths of a man. We enshrined in the Constitution a grave error, and the policy decision, the wrong policy decision was perpetrated from then on.

We failed to include in the Declaration of Independence the long section that Jefferson wrote condemning slavery. It was taken out as a compromise. So we failed again in our public policy to deal with the problem. Later on, Jefferson attempted to pass a bill which banned slavery in all of the States that would be added to the Union and it lost by 1 vote in Congress. It lost by 1 vote.

We failed in public policy again. It went on and on until you have the blood bath of the Civil War.

So we have a responsibility to correct the results, the by-product of past Government failures. What the Swiss are doing finally, in their offering of a fund for \$5 billion is saying that we accept some of that responsibility in the case of what happened with the Jews in the Second World War. The Swiss are setting a great example.

I was speaking to some bankers this morning at a breakfast and I said, look, you bankers who worry so much about the Community Reinvestment Act and the small amount of money you put into big cities and minority neighborhoods, you worry about every penny and you nickel and dime us to death. Why do you not look at the example now being set by the Swiss? Why not have the American millionaires and the tremendous amounts of accumulation of American wealth in America respond to some human needs in America in the same way the Swiss now begin to respond? It took the Swiss 50 years.

Switzerland is a beautiful little country; I have been there twice. It is amazing how clean it is, how orderly it is; law and order is fantastic in Switzerland. Switzerland has a very educated population. In Switzerland the people dress nicely, they look nice and they act nicely, but that does not govern morality. There is no correlation between sanitation and cleanliness and morality.

They behaved abominably. They behaved like the worst of humanity by operating in cahoots with the Germans to take the wealth of all of these helpless people. They denied entry into Switzerland to people who were running from the terror of the Holocaust. They did terrible things. Some people have said, well, they have \$5 billion they are now willing to put up. That is not enough. They want justice. Let us calculate how much they have earned and all the money they stole and make them pay up.

I do not think we should ask for justice, it has taken so long to this point. Reconciliation is greater than justice, reconciliation is more important than justice. Justice we may never have. Steps have been taken toward reconciliation; let us accept those steps.

I think I have said before that sometimes it seems that civilization is not going forward. Terrible things have happened in a nation like Germany, with large numbers of educated people, leaders, the history of producing the greatest musicians in the world, the greatest scientists, the greatest mathematicians. A nation like Germany created also some of the greatest crimes against humanity on a scale that no other set of terrorists have ever been able to accomplish in the world.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHIFF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and on March 8 on account of official business.

Mr. STRICKLAND (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. DREIER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and tomorrow on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. NORTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LAHOOD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. GRANGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAPPAS, for 5 minutes, on March 6.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, on March 6.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today and on March 11.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, on March 6.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. OWENS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. NORTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. CONDIT.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. WEYGAND.

Mr. KUCINICH.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. BERMAN.
Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LAHOOD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. PORTER.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. GOSS.
Mr. PORTMAN.
Mr. THOMAS.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. DEAL of Georgia in two instances.

Mr. GOODLATTE.
Mr. COOK.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. CALLAHAN.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. WALSH.
Mr. MCINTOSH.
Mr. EWING.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.
Mr. SHAYS.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mr. CONDIT.
Mr. PICKERING.
Ms. STABENOW.
Mr. SHAW.
Mr. ENGEL.
Mr. MCDERMOTT.
Mr. SHERMAN.
Mr. ORTIZ.
Mr. CHRISTENSEN.
Ms. HARMAN.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. CLAY.
Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
Mr. RAHALL.
Mr. VENTO.
Mr. QUINN.
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
Mr. SOLOMON.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On February 28, 1997:

H.R. 668. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the Airport and Airways Trust Fund excise taxes, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 6, 1997, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2093. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report pursuant to section 1306(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997, pursuant to Public Law 104-201, section 1306(c) (110 Stat. 2707); to the Committee on National Security.

2094. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's reports entitled "1997 Salary Rates" for its employees in grades 1-15 and "Executive Level Salary Ranges" for its executive level employees, pursuant to section 1206 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 [FIRREA]; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2095. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency [NAMSA] [Transmittal No. 08-97], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2; to the Committee on International Relations.

2096. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Spain (Transmittal No. DTC-13-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

2097. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Spain (Transmittal No. DTC-12-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

2098. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Japan (Transmittal No. DTC-19-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

2099. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC-39-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

2100. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to Switzerland (Transmittal No. DTC-2-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2101. A letter from the Director of Fiscal Resources, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2102. A letter from the Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year

1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2103. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2104. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2105. A letter from the Acting Executive Secretary, National Security Council, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2106. A letter from The Special Counsel, Office of the Special Counsel, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2107. A letter from the Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2108. A letter from the Director, Financial Services, Library of Congress, transmitting a copy of the U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission annual report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996; to the Committee on House Oversight.

2109. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of his determination that Israel is not being denied its right to participate in the activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency, pursuant to Public Law 99-88, chapter V (99 Stat. 232); Public Law 100-461, title I (102 Stat. 2268-3); jointly, to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

2110. A letter from the Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a copy of the Commission's report entitled "Federal Sector Report on EEO Complaints and Appeals, FY 1995" and a copy of the EEOC's "Annual Report on the Employment of Minorities, Women, and People with Disabilities in the Federal Government, FY 1995," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000e-4(e); jointly, to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and Education and the Workforce.

2111. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's December 1996 "Treasury Bulletin," pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

2112. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Anti-Gang and Youth Violence Act of 1997"; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Education and the Workforce, and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 922. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds to conduct or support research on the cloning of humans; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 923. A bill to prohibit the cloning of humans; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma):

H.R. 924. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to give further assurance to the right of victims of crime to attend and observe the trials of those accused of the crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KLUG, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. STARK, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. CARSON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 925. A bill to prohibit the Department of Defense from allowing defense contractors to recoup merger-related restructuring costs from the taxpayers; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 926. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit Federal prisoners to engage in community service projects; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 927. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for appointment of U.S. marshals by the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTENSEN (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 928. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to ensure that employees have adequate access and information regarding the use of employee dues and fees paid to labor organizations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CANADY of Florida (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KLINK, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr.

GOODLATTE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUINN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MICA, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BUYER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. JOHN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RYUN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BONO, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. JONES, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LINDER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PETRI, Mr. NEY, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. POMBO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. METCALF, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PEASE, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 929. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORN (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MICA, and Mr. PORTMAN):

H.R. 930. A bill to require Federal employees to use Federal travel charge cards for all payments of expenses of official Government travel, to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish requirements for prepayment audits of Federal agency transportation expenses, to authorize reimbursement of Federal agency employees for taxes incurred on travel or transportation reimbursements, and to authorize test programs for the payment of Federal employee travel expenses and relocation expenses; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 931. A bill to provide an exception to the restrictions on eligibility for public benefits for certain legal aliens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii):

H.R. 932. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the appointment in each U.S. circuit court of appeals, of at least one resident of each State

in such circuit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin:

H.R. 933. A bill to expand the definition of limited tax benefit for purposes of the Line Item Veto Act; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland (for

himself, Mr. DELAY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. BONO, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. METCALF, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 934. A bill to prohibit the payment to the United Nations of any contributions by the United States until U.S. overpayments to such body have been properly credited or reimbursed; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 935. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to impose a penalty upon States that do not give full faith and credit to the protective orders of other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.R. 936. A bill to authorize further appropriations for the stabilization and repair of damages to the Mountain Quarries Railroad Bridge, commonly known as No Hands Bridge, caused by the heavy rains and flooding in California in December 1996 and January 1997; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 937. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion in gross income of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 938. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to extend the period of time within which workers may file a petition for trade adjustment assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 939. A bill to permit revocation by members of the clergy of their exemption from Social Security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 940. A bill to reform the Federal unemployment benefits system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EWING (for himself, Ms. DUNN of Washington, and Mr. KOLBE):

H.R. 941. A bill to provide for permanent most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China when that country becomes a member of the World Trade Organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H.R. 942. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide authority for States to limit the interstate transportation of municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 943. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide authority for States to control the movement of municipal solid waste to waste management facilities within the boundaries of the State or within the boundaries of political subdivisions of the State; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 944. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require improved disclosure of corporate charitable contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 945. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require corporations to obtain the views of shareholders concerning corporate charitable contributions; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NEY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. FURSE, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 946. A bill to amend chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that annuities for Members of Congress be computed under the same formula as applies to Federal employees generally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. NEY, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. FROST, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FURSE, Mr. CANNON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 947. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the research credit and to allow greater opportunity to elect the alternative incremental credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 948. A bill to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationship of the Burt Lake Band as a distinct federally recognized Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 949. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the disposition of a firearm to, and the possession of a firearm by, nonpermanent resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TORRES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FOGLE-

ETTA, Mr. MANTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. DIXON):

H.R. 950. A bill to establish a national public works program to provide incentives for the creation of jobs and address the restoration of infrastructure in communities across the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 951. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands located in Hinsdale, CO; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 952. A bill to clarify the mission, purposes, and authorized uses of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and to establish requirements for administration and conservation planning for that system; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FROST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MASCARA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 953. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs regarding ovarian cancer; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. OXLEY (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado):

H.R. 954. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to authorize foreign investment in U.S. broadcast and common carrier radio licenses; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. TALENT):

H.R. 955. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the deduction of home office expenses where the home office is the sole fixed location of the business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 956. A bill to amend the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 to establish a program to support and encourage local communities that first demonstrate a comprehensive, long-term commitment to reduce substance abuse among youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself and Mr. MCHALE):

H.R. 957. A bill to abolish the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the House of Representatives, establish an Independent Commission on House Ethics, and provide for the transfer of the duties and functions of the Committee to the Independent Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOUNDER:

H.R. 958. A bill to prohibit United States assistance to Mexico for fiscal year 1998 unless the Government of Mexico meets certain narcotics control requirements; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 959. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to restrict the mail-order sale of body armor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 960. A bill to validate certain conveyances in the city of Tulare, Tulare County, CA, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. FARR of California):

H.R. 961. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the requirement that States pay unemployment compensation on the basis of services performed by election workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 962. A bill to redesignate a Federal building in Suitland, MD, as the "W. Edwards Deming Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution expressing support for equal and fair access to higher education in the Albanian language in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CONDIT (for himself and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Sikh Nation should be allowed to exercise the right of national self-determination in their homeland, Punjab, Khalistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. JOHN, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the collection of ancestry data as part of the decennial census of population; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H. Res. 81. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on International Relations in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H. Res. 82. Resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. PORTER):

H. Res. 83. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal commitment to biomedical research should be increased substantially over the next 5 years; to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. RILEY.
 H.R. 9: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 34: Mr. GRAHAM.
 H.R. 38: Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. PARKER.
 H.R. 59: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BAKER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
 H.R. 65: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. DICKS.
 H.R. 66: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 69: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 80: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 86: Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 96: Mr. BURR of North Carolina and Ms. FURSE.
 H.R. 107: Mr. BORSKI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CONDIT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 108: Mr. QUINN and Mr. PARKER.
 H.R. 127: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. SABO.
 H.R. 203: Mr. FARR of California.
 H.R. 215: Mr. FAZIO of California.
 H.R. 230: Mr. FOLEY.
 H.R. 240: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 250: Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 279: Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. FAZIO of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 280: Mr. EVANS, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 284: Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 285: Mr. COYNE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 286: Mr. COYNE and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 287: Mr. COYNE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 289: Mr. NEY.
 H.R. 303: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DICKS.
 H.R. 328: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 336: Mr. STUMP and Mr. POMBO.
 H.R. 337: Mr. WEXLER, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 363: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 371: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HORN, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 H.R. 399: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. PARKER.
 H.R. 419: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DELLUMS, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.
 H.R. 420: Mr. CAMPBELL.
 H.R. 437: Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 443: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 444: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 446: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 474: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 475: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. NORWOOD.
 H.R. 498: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 519: Mrs. KELLY.
 H.R. 535: Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 536: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. FORD.
 H.R. 538: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. YATES, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LAFALCE.
 H.R. 554: Mr. POMEROY.
 H.R. 560: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 561: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 582: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. DELLUMS.
 H.R. 586: Mr. NUSSLE and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 607: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. PARKER.
 H.R. 621: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 667: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ROGAN.
 H.R. 678: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of

New Jersey, Mr. MCCRERY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 680: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 686: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 688: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 714: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 722: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. JONES, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 734: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 750: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 755: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. LARGENT.

H.R. 789: Ms. DUNN of Washington.

H.R. 800: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 825: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 849: Mr. BONO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 867: Mr. RAMSTAD and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 879: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. CARSON, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 880: Mr. DELAY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 907: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JONES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. WICKER.

H. Con. Res. 6: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. STUPAK.

H. Con. Res. 13: Ms. FURSE and Mr. COSTELLO.

H. Con. Res. 14: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. YATES, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. FLAKE.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. FALOMAVAEGA.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H. Res. 64: Mrs. CARSON.